

QUARTERLY

ANTI-SLAVERY MAGAZINE.

VOLUME II.

Edited by
ELIZUR WRIGHT, JR.

NEW-YORK:
PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
No. 143 Nassau Street.

M.DCCC.XXXVII.

NEW-YORK:
WILLIAM S. DORR, PRINTER,
No. 123 Fulton Street.

CONTENTS.

No. V., for October 1836.

Blindness of the South in attempting to drive the North, 9.

I. ON THE COLORED PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, By Charles Stuart 11

American prejudice compared with Hindoo and African, 11.—Colored people are mostly native Americans, 12.—Power of facts to dispel prejudice—Slaves grossly misrepresented, as to native intellect, &c., 13.—Moral character of the slaves, 14.—Character of the *free* colored, 15.—Degradation—and the cause of it, 14.—Conduct of colored people in Philadelphia during the yellow fever of 1793, 18.—Certificate of Matthew Clarkson—Testimony of General Jackson, 19. Colored people in Philadelphia in 1830,—Testimony of a Committee of the Senate of Pennsylvania, 20.—Their benevolent Institutions—those of New-York, 21.—P.S. "Abstinence from the products of slave labor," 22.

II. AMERICAN SLAVERY vs. HUMAN LIBERTY, By a Kentuckian 22

Slavery worse in itself than political despotism, 22.—Slavery grows worse from its contrast with liberty—tramples on all rights—political despotism recognizes some, 23.—Political despotism professes the good of the subject—Slavery avows the good of the master as the only end—one tyrant is less oppressive than a multitude, 25.—Human liberty has more to fear from *American* slavery than from any other form of despotism, 26.—Slavery will destroy our free institutions, 29.—More dangerous because not suspected, 31.—Encourages hypocrisy, 32.—Smothers discussion, 33.—Demoralizes by its falsehoods, 34.—Tends to reconcile the nation to horrible deformities, 36.—Steps already taken towards ruin, 38.

III. THE CHURCH CARRIED ALONG; OR THE OPINIONS OF A D.D. ON SLAVERY, By Rev. Beriah Green 41

Rev. John H. Rice D.D. and the Christian Spectator, 41.—Dr. Rice thinks slavery the greatest evil except whiskey, but opposed to any movement of the Church, 42.—He makes slavery dependant on the *public will*, 44.—His objection to "combination" considered, 45.—Calculation of consequences, 46.—Poor results of such calculation, 47.—Unmanageableness of "religious feeling," 48.—Associations of Connecticut and Massachusetts, 49.—Abolitionists prize the "religious feeling," 50.—Excitement, 50, 51.—Church meddling with temporal affairs, 51.—What sort of a prayer Dr. Rice would approve, 53.—How the Church is carried

along, 56.—Dr. Rice's plan of abolition founded on falsehood, 57.—Overlooks the supports of slavery, 58.—Results of it have been bad, 59.—Such results were necessary, 60.

VI. THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM IN OUR COUNTRY, By Dr. C. Follen..... 61

Liberty and oppression always and every where in conflict—Oppression at work in our country, 62.—Experiment of self-government successful so far as it has been tried—Slavery not a local evil, 64.—Anti-republicanism, in principle, identical with slavery—its increase—persecution of the Indians, 65.—Taste for aristocratic distinction, 66.—Pursuit of wealth, 67.—Redeeming influences, 68.—Need of combining all the friends of freedom, 70.—Anti-Liberty doctrines of Pickens and Calhoun, 71.—Slaveholders endeavoring to enlist all property-holders on their side, 71.—True liberty can only be built on the doctrine of equal human rights, 72.

V. SLAVERY AND THE CONSTITUTION, By Rev. J. May..... 73

Are the people of the non-slaveholding states bound by the Constitution not to attempt the overthrow of slavery? 73.—The affirmative is a heavy charge against the framers, 74.—Power of the framers, 75.—Jealousy for state rights, 76.—The right and wrong of slavery not discussed at the time of the Revolution, 77.—The old confederation had no power to abolish the slave trade, 78.—All that can be said of the Constitution, is that it did not abolish slavery, 79.—The preamble, 79.—Ratio of representation, 80.—Implication of the word "persons," 81.—"Migration and importation," 82.—Debates of the Conventions of the States, 83.—Fugitives, 84.—Jury trial, 85.—Protection against "domestic violence," 88.

VI. REV. F. A. COX, D.D., AND HIS AMERICAN APOLOGISTS..... 90

Appointment of Drs. Cox and Hoby, 91.—British and Foreign society for universal abolition—its objects, 92.—Dr. Welch of Albany, 92.—Dr. Cox's note, 94.—Instructions to Mr. Thomson, 96.—Sentiments of Abraham Booth, 97.—Dr. Cox in New Hampshire, 98.—Rev. S. A. Cone, 100.—Rev. Howard Malcom, 101.—Charleston Baptist Association, 103.

VII. LAND PIRACY, By the Editor..... 104

Run of small slaveholders, 104.—Virgil A. Stewart's story, 105.—Rumored insurrection at Livingston, 107.—Proceedings thereon—Hanging without jury, 109.—Trial of Albe Dean, 110.

NEW PUBLICATIONS..... 112

Miss Grimke's Appeal—Yarndee—Glasgow Discussion, 112.

No. VI., for January, 1837.

Abolitionists aim to rectify the primary elements of society, 113.

I. SLAVERY AND THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY, By Rev. Samuel Crothers.... 115

The defence of slavery left to theological professors, 115.—Ground and character of the contest changed, 116.—"Five ways" of making slaves, 117.—Jahn, the Pope and the Jesuits, 119.—The morality of Princeton and Guinea identical, 120.—Slavery by captivity, 121.—By purchase, 124.—By the right of creditorship,

126.—By the sentence of a judge, 128.—By birth, 129.—Slaveholding among the surrounding nations—among the Hebrews, 131.

II. ABOLITION A RELIGIOUS ENTERPRISE, By Rev. Henry Cowles.....133

American slavery a sin, 133.—Brutalizes, 134.—Cherishes bad passions in its supporters, 135.—Involves principles hostile to piety, 136.—Why abolition should be prosecuted religiously, 140.

III. THE CONSTITUTION, By N. P. Rogers Esq.145

If the Constitution sanctions slavery, it is the most iniquitous of all documents, 145.—But slavery is not *in* the instrument, if the framers *designed* it to be there, 146.—Slavery is unconstitutional to the letter—Declaration and preamble evidences of intent, 147.—Slave Representation, 149.—Fugitives, 150.—Republican state governments guaranteed—Amendments, 151.—No deprivation of liberty without due process of law, 152.

IV. ON THE USE OF SLAVE PRODUCE, By Charles Stuart..... 153

Slave produce defined, 153.—Unnecessary consumption a transgression of the divine law—reason, 154.—If there were no buyers, there would be no slaveholders, 155.—Consumers can crush slavery, 156.—Sentiments of the Quarterly A. S. Magazine condemned, 157.—Illustration of the poor widows' two mites, 158.—Difficulties do not abolish law, 160.—Slave produce stolen goods, 162.—Physical expedients, 164.—Slave in Jamaica, 266.—Compulsory effect of abstinence, 168.—The excuse of necessity, 170.—Difficulty confined to cotton, 171.—Remarks by the Editor, 172.

V. CASTE IN THE UNITED STATES; A REVIEW, by the Editor.....175

Absurdity of caste under a free government, 176—Intolerable tyranny of caste in America, 178.—M. de Beaumont and M. de Tocqueville, 178.—Story of Ludovic, 179.—Caste in New-Orleans, 182.—Prejudice in public assemblies, 184.—The tyranny of the one drop, 185.—Theory of a Connecticut divine, 186.—Insincerity of our professions of regard for the Anglo-Saxon blood, 187.—M. de Beaumont's freedom from prejudice, 187.—Mob in Utica, 188.—Inference from the "Disclaimer,"—cause of hostility to the negroes, 189.—Connection of caste with the abolition of slavery, 190.—Color not the real object of hatred—two classes of the prejudiced, 191.—Charles Lamb, 193.—The authority of custom, 194.—Caste injures our national character, 195.—Is a reproach to republicanism, 196.—Is a disgrace to Christianity, 196.—Separation in religious worship, 197.—A waste of the national resources, 198.

VI. THE DIVERSITIES OF MEN..... 199

Influence of heat on complexion, 199.—General law of vegetable and animal variation, 200.—Power of adaptation in plants, 201.—Diversities of men compared with those of brutes, 202.—Enumeration of human races, 204.—Effect of tropical climates upon Europeans, 206.—Diversities of intellect, 207.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF AMERICAN COMMERCE..... 208

Extracts from Niles' Register, 209.

OPINIONS AND TESTIMONY OF THOMAS JEFFERSON.....	210
Letter to Dr. Price, 210—to Gov. Cole, 212.	
FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.....	213
French society for the abolition of slavery, 213.—Minutes of the sittings, 214.	
A NATION'S BROKEN VOW.....	216
DOMESTIC AFFAIRS BRIEFLY.....	216

No. VII., for April 1837.

Folly of our great men, 218.

I. SLAVERY AND THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY, By Rev. Samuel Crothers.... 219

Examination of the proof that "slavery was tolerated among the ancient people of God," 219.—If it proves any thing, it proves that every country in Christendom is a slave country, that slavery was the only servitude tolerated by the Scriptures, 220.—When does "*obed*" mean *slave*? Answers and illustrations, 221.—*Buying* servants, 223.—The character of Abraham's servants.

II. SLAVERY AND THE CONSTITUTION, By Rev. Samuel John May..... 226

Care of the framers to avoid the mention of slavery—the Constitution recognizes as citizens *all* who in any of the states possess the elective franchise, 227.—Inference that the framers looked forward to universal abolition, 228.—Sentiments of Dr. Franklin, 229.—Constitution gives Congress power to abolish the slave trade, which was considered the same in effect as the abolition of slavery, 231.—Opinion of Daniel Webster and others on the power of Congress over the domestic slave trade, 232.—Power of Congress over the District of Columbia, 234.—Provision of the Constitution for its own amendment, 237.

III. IS SLAVERY FROM ABOVE OR FROM BENEATH? 238

The Bible the last resort of slavery, 238.—Definition of slavery, 238.—Apprenticeship, 240.—Claims of the government on criminals, &c., 241.—Legal definition. 244.—Eighth Commandment, 245.—Man-stealing, 247.—Man distinguished from property, 249.—Man created in the image of God, 253.—Import of the word "*buy*," &c., 254.—Groundless assumption, 255.—Things bought are not necessarily property, 256.—Buying of wives, 257.—Hebrew word translated *buy*, 258.—English use of the word *buy*, 259.—Joseph and the Egyptians, 260.—Persons who were bought sold themselves, 261.—Design of the Mosaic laws—rights and privileges of servants, 262.—Festival releases, 263.—Voluntariness of servants, 266.—Pay of servants, 274.—Were servants held as *property*? No. 281.—Objections, Laban gave handmaids, 282.—Servants were enumerated in inventories of property, 283.—Testimony of the Targums, 285.—Respect paid to servants, 286.—The Gibeonites, 288.—Egyptian bondage analyzed, 291.—Objections considered, 295.—"Cursed be Canaan," 296.—Smiting a servant or maid with a rod, &c., Ex. xxi. 20, 21., 299.—Lev. 25. 44–46., 306.—"Forever," 308.—Inheritance and possession, 311.—Hired servants and bond servants, 313.—Different classes of

servants, 327.—Typical nature of the Mosaic system, 329.—Slavery not penal, 331.—Destruction of the Canaanites considered, 332.

THE CRUELTY OF SLAVERY.....340

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.....341

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS.....343

NEW PUBLICATIONS.....344

No. VIII., for July, 1837.

Additions to the slaveholding power, 345.

I. FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY....347

Deaths of Managers—increase of Auxiliaries, 347.—Publications—Agents—Agents for colored people, 349.—Colored people in Ohio—occupation of land, 349.—Colored people in Upper Canada—Testimony of Dunlap and Mackenzie, 350.—of John H. Dunn—Anti-slavery among children, 351.—Agents to the West Indies—Charleston ladies—George Thompson, 352.—Robert Breckinridge—Dr. Wardlaw, 353.—British Baptists, 354.—Virginian in Scotland—Dumbarton and the Vale of Leven, 355.—Favorable notice of ecclesiastical bodies, 356, 357, 358.—Legislature of Pennsylvania, 359.—Mr. Stevens' Report—Governor Ritner's Message, 360.—Resolutions of Vermont and Massachusetts, 361.—Decision of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, in the case of the girl Med, 362.—Abolitionism at the South, 363.—Maryville Intelligencer, 364.—Commercial crisis, 366.—Affairs of Mississippi, 367.—British cotton trade, 368.—Imports of cotton, in the years 1835 and 1836, 369.—Rice and tobacco, 370.—Bearing of diminished profits upon the abolition of slavery, 371.—General participation in the profits of slavery, 372.—Northern sycophancy, 373.—Publishers, 374.—Books "expunged" and mutilated, 375.—Profligacy of the press, 377.—Ecclesiastical opposition, 377.—Methodist General Conference, 378.—Threatening epistles, 379.—Presbyterian General Assembly, 380.—Testimony of Rev. Mr. Smylie, 386.—Harmony Presbytery, 386.—Clinton Resolutions, 378.—Congregational General Associations, 388.—Dignity of the pastoral office, 392.—Mobs—Judge Lawless—Grand Jury of St. Louis, 394.—Persecutions of Mr. Lovejoy and Dr. Nelson, 395.—Persecution of Mr. Garratt, 396.—Dr. Ely and Marion College, 396, 397.—Rebuke of the New-York Observer, Vermont Chronicle, and Boston Recorder, 397.—Attack on the Philanthropist, 398.—Mob-meeting in Cincinnati, 399.—The Market House Committee, 401.—Firmness of the Ohio Executive Committee, 402.—Speech of the Mayor of Cincinnati to the mob, 403.—Outrage upon Mr. Kitchell, 404.—Outrage upon Mr. Hopper, 405.—Testimony of the Hon. B. Swain of North Carolina, 405.—CHAPTER OF ABOMINATIONS, 406.—Flogging to death—shooting with small shot—suicides, 406.—Branding—outlawing—rewards for killing—death for striking, 407.—Burning alive—shooting runaways—pulling out gray hairs, 408.—Dogging men—Amalgamation—DOMESTIC SLAVE TRADE, 409.—Slave trade advertisements, 410.—POLITICAL SUPPORT OF SLAVERY, 412.—Denial of the rights of petition in Congress, 413.—Petition from slaves—Hon. John Q. Adams, 414.—President's Inaugural Address, 415.—MEASURES, 421.—Tyranny of caste to be over-

thrown, 423.—Facts in regard to American prejudice, 424.—New-Bedford whale-ship owned and navigated by colored men, 427.—Use of the press, 427.—POLITICAL ACTION, 429.—Petitions to Congress, 431.—Fugitives, 432.—Jury trial—Texas, 433.—Haytian Independence, 434.

II. WAS SLAVERY FORCED UPON THE SOUTH? A letter from Dr. John Farmer 439

NEW PUBLICATIONS..... 447

Whittier's poems, 447.—Miss Martineau's Society in America, 448.

Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine.

NO. V.—For October, 1836.

It is happy for mankind that monsters are not immortal. Overruling benevolence has kindly subjected their savage natures to the control of humanity. What they exceed in strength they lack in wisdom, so that gentleness is fated, in the end, always to triumph. A monster to which these remarks emphatically apply is Slavery, which needs only to be pricked with the spear of truth and it will speedily dash out its own brains. The paroxysms of the beast are already ominous of its end.

Slaveholders have been so long used to the *driving system*, in what they call their *domestic economy*, that they find it hard to use any other, especially where they consider their interests deeply involved. Were they as anxious to *hire* the politicians of the North, as the latter are to be hired, they might, at a cheap rate, protect their darling system of whipped labor for a good many years to come. But it goes against their grain to pay wages. They would think it worth while to *purchase* a northern president, provided they could be put in possession of a true *bill of sale*, setting forth that the said chief magistrate is become the property of the South; but they cannot think of exalting a non-slaveholder to the dignity of a party to a bargain—with power to recede at pleasure. Most astonishing but fortunate blindness! Here stands the North, cap in hand, ready to be hired to do the dirtiest jobs—cheap. Yet the South has the folly to think she can *drive* cheaper than she can *hire*. She tells the politicians of the North they are a faithless set of rogues who cannot be trusted out of the reach of the overseer's whip, and that they will no sooner have got

what they ask, than they will forget all their solemn promises to do wrong, and behave as freemen should! What could be more favorable to the cause of humanity? The politicians of the North cannot be openly driven. The vis motrix, to speak rather learnedly, must be applied gastro-peithically, and not notopathically. If we do not mistake the signs of the times, the present state of things is near its end. The political driving of the slaveholders is becoming so much like their agricultural, that the subjects of both will soon begin to sympathise with each other.

It will be of little avail to the South to gain Texas, if she loses the services of the North. The North has furnished her a grand cordon of constables to pick up that straggling part of her population which rushes to a land where it "cannot breathe." Such a land, brought up side by side with the old hives where *human labor* is grown for the market, will inevitably produce a scarcity of that article unfavorable to Texas lands. Indeed, what less would it do than to effect an enfranchisement of the whole enslaved race. We have seen a boy, as stupid as he was cruel, whipping a miserable horse *confined in a pound*, but we presume the beast would not have stood so still on a common—and we think so of the slaves. The slaveholders, at their present rate of driving, will soon have to choose between doing the fair thing by their laborers, and doing without them. They will have a practical illustration at the North of one of the laws of what they are pleased to call Jewish Slavery—a law to which, in their pious references to the Bible, they always forget to refer us—viz.: "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant that is escaped from his master unto thee; he shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose, in one of thy gates where it liketh *him* best; thou shalt not oppress him."

THE
QUARTERLY
ANTI-SLAVERY MAGAZINE.

VOL. II.

OCTOBER, 1836.

NO. 1.

ON THE COLORED PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES.

BY CHARLES STUART.

"WHY did you treat that man with such contempt," said an English gentleman to a Brahmin—"Because," replied the lordly priest "he is a *Pariah*."—

"What makes you hate the French so much" said a minister to an English prisoner in Newgate, about fifty years ago.—"Because," replied the prisoner, "they speak *French* and wear *wooden* shoes."

"Is it not very ridiculous," said a Missionary not long since, to an African on the East coast of Africa, thus to deposit provisions, &c., in the graves of your departed friends—"It is my country's *fash*" (fashion or custom) replied the African.

"Why do you wish those people removed to Africa, or to some other place beyond the limits of the United States?" "Because they are of the proscribed class," replied the United States' man!! Why do you object to placing them in this their native country under benignant and impartial laws immediately and thoroughly? Because their poor mothers were outraged before them, replied the same.

Which of these is the best reasoning? The Brahmin's; or the British felon's; or the heathen African's; or the civilized United States' man's?

I know the United States' man pretends to other reasons—"They are so incorrigibly vicious and degraded, says he (*confuting himself*) that we must send them to enlighten and christianize Africa!!! They are so inhuman and per-

verse, that though the meekest and gentlest of men, under the most burning provocations; yet if you were to treat them with cordial equity and kindness, they would immediately rise and murder you!! The gospel of Christ, which is all powerful to conquer sins of the grossest and most inveterate stamp in heathen and benighted Africa, idolatry, oppression and lust; is utterly incapable of controlling the most insane and criminal prejudices in the United States; therefore must the criminals remove the sufferers from incorrigible America, to teachable Africa!!

But leaving these dreams of tyrant prejudice and pride, I proceed—

Who *are* the colored people of the United States—omitting the few thousands feloniously imported and yet surviving?

They are a multitude of native born Americans, of all colors—in number, about 2,700,000—nearly 400,000 of these, in various senses, *free*—and upwards of 2,300,000 of them, more or less deeply enslaved—despised and oppressed, not simply on account of color; for some of them are fairer than their masters—not simply on account of their vices or degradation; for probably they are the least criminal part of the community; and multitudes of a stamp decidedly more vicious, turbulent and degraded, are continually received and welcomed from foreign lands—but despised and degraded, because their poor mothers were similarly despised and degraded before them. Take up an American in Boston or New-York on suspicion of being a runaway slave—let his color, as dark as ebony, if you please—and his hair as woolly as wool, testify against him—or let his character, be as vile or as stupid as vile or stupid can be—and yet he is not convicted—he *may* yet be a free man. Prove him even to be the son of a *foreign slave*, and he yet is free. But prove *his mother* to have been an *enslaved American* and that he has sought an asylum from slavery *without his oppressor's permission*, and his liberty is gone—his poor mother's misery in being born an American, not a foreigner, is made his guilt, and without even the charge of a crime, he is treated as though he were one of the worst of felons.

But in the article before me, I wish rather to do justice to the character and conduct of these outraged and suffering

people; than to dwell upon the guilt of their oppressors. One reason, doubtless, of the wrongs which they are enduring, consists in the false conceptions entertained against them. Represent a man as a drunkard, and many hearts which would respect him, if they knew him to be a sober man will be alienated from him as a drunkard. Give such hearts sufficient testimony that he is a sober man, and their enmity is gone. Let such hearts be satisfied, that the people called colored in the United States, are as worthy of confidence, respect and affection as the other classes of community in the United States, and they will esteem them equally. The prejudices which have darkened them, will be dissipated by the light of truth, justice will be substituted for injustice—love for enmity—and the cordial hand of help will be busy in making them happy *at home*—instead of their being crushed in their native places by the heel of despotism; or spurned to *foreign lands* by the foot of scorn.

The slaves as a body, are exceedingly misrepresented. The influences of circumstances upon mind, are overlooked—and the difference between cultivation and intellect, between learning and intelligence, is disregarded—the poor sufferers are contemplated in the attitude in which slavery exhibits them; and in contempt alike of nature and of history, it is cruelly and insanely presumed, that under the happier influences of *lawful liberty*, they would remain the same; just as if, when a slaveholder is breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the advocates of impartial liberty, it should be affirmed, that amidst the blandishments of his own table, where an entirely different class of motives excited in his mind totally dissimilar emotions, he would still exhibit the same furious and malignant passions.

The slaves of the United States, as a body, are a remarkably intelligent, discreet and virtuous class—not cultivated—not learned—not discreet *as Christians*—not virtuous in a *regenerate sense*—not virtuous, even in a natural sense, when *that purity* is meant, which most adorns unregenerate nature—but *intelligent*, as being remarkably shrewd; quick to apprehend; tenacious to remember and skilful to apply—*discreet*, as exhibiting wonderful good sense and good temper, in making the best of their miserable lot—and *virtuous*, as compared with their masters and their mas-

ters' class ; as being decidedly the *least criminal* of the two ; as generally exhibiting better qualities, than probably any other people on earth would exhibit, under similar provocations. They are eminently gentle, submissive, affectionate and grateful. It is almost impossible to excite them to revenge. Nothing is easier, with a little good sense, justice and kindness, than to win their hearts. Notwithstanding the ignorance in which they are kept, and the sickening of heart which arises from hope deferred, (Prov. xiii. 12.) they often display such moral worth and such intellectual power, that their very masters ask their opinions, and seek their advice. When treated cruelly, in ninety-nine cases out of the hundred, they take it patiently. When treated kindly, they would shed their blood for their kind "*Massas*." They make as good ploughmen, and seedmen, and hoemen ; as good mechanics ; as good accountants ; *though ignorant of letters* ; as eager aspirants after property, when its acquisition is at all placed within their reach, and the least security is promised them in its enjoyment ; as acute bargain-drivers ; as shrewd business men ; as discreet and faithful confidants ; as wise and as good stewards ; as staunch and faithful friends as any other class of men whatsoever, in proportion to circumstances. There is not a set of people on earth more fitted for liberty, *under just and benignant laws*, than the slaves of the United States. Gentle, submissive, affectionate and grateful—incapable almost of being provoked to bitterness—most easily conciliated to gratitude and affection—thoroughly inured to subordination and to regular labor—perfectly acquainted with the soils, the seasons, and all the local productions of the earth—teachable, humble, lively, intelligent—eager for knowledge—eminently accessible to religious impressions ; and, above most men, attached to the place of their birth, and to the associates and associations of their earlier years, all that is wanting to place them amongst the most happy and useful of men, is *repentance*, and *fruits meet for repentance*, on the part of their masters—or, in other words, the immediate and thorough substitution, by the lawful authorities, of justice and kindness, for injustice and brute force—of equitable and benignant laws, impartially and firmly administered, for the mischief-making enactments and practices of the slave states.

The people called "*Free Colored*" in the United States,

are in number about 400,000. They are of all colors and of various classes. Like every other body of men, they have *leading* characteristics—and as in every other body, in these leading characteristics, many exceptions are found. We may also observe that, as among other bodies of men, these *leading* characteristics, are *leading*, either in relation to *number* or to *mind*—*leading*, as being exhibited by the *majority* of the whole—or, *leading*, as being exhibited by the few more energetic and prominent minds, which, although comparatively few in number, yet by their energy impress externally their character upon the whole—as for instance :—

When we estimate the leading characteristics of the people of the United States, in view of *number*, we find the majority industrious, enterprising, money-making, active, dauntless, well mannered, as to real civility, though often excessively coarse, as to mere politeness; kind husbands and fathers; good neighbors, and orderly and well behaved in public life. We also find them, proud, boastful, hugging their own liberties and rights with idolatrous devotion, and trampling with all possible insolence and injustice, upon the equally sacred rights and liberties of others—exactng the most just and affectionate attention to their own feelings, and tearing to pieces without compunction the equally sacred feelings of others—thundering their love of liberty through the world, while they are deliberately retaining one-sixth part of their whole native population, without even the charge of a crime, in the most ignominious bondage—and boasting even of revivals of religion, where the guilt and shame of slavery and prejudice are studiously covered up, and where old and new converts together, following their leaders, continue to “build their houses by unrighteousness and their chambers by wrong”—to use their neighbor’s service without wages, and to give him not for his work.” And they will not “judge the cause of the poor and the needy” but still set their “eyes and their hearts upon their covetousness, for to shed innocent blood, and for oppression, and for violence, to do it.” Jer. xxii. 13, 16, 17.

When we estimate the leading characteristics of the people of the United States, in view of *mind*, we may make the estimate by referring either to *politicians* or to *christians*. The politicians I leave to their politics. Referring to chris-

tians, we find the United States radiant before the world, as the land of Bible, Missionary, Religious Tract, Sunday School, Temperance, Peace, Anti-Slavery and Moral Reform Associations, &c. &c.; and we feel at a loss to estimate its glory. But alas! while *christian mind* impresses this glorious form of outward beauty upon the United States, how few of the whole population, ever contribute to the effort; and how many even of those few, are practically unsound in relation to the forced servitude, and the brutal prejudices of color or of caste, which distort and disgrace their country.

Thus I proceed to speak of the class called "*free colored*," in the United States: generally, in relation to *number*, first—and secondly, in relation to *mind*: in both cases not noticing the exceptions.

1st, In relation to number, arithmetically,

I find by the tables annexed to Mr. Paxton's letters on slavery, that the number of people, called free colored, in 1790, was 59,511. In 1800, was 110,072. In 1810, was 186,446. In 1820, was 226,775. In 1830, was 319,467. And in round numbers, I now place it by conjecture at nearly 400,000.

In relation to number, morally and socially.

Generally speaking, they are degraded, ignorant and poor. It is said that they are more than ordinarily vicious; but of this I find no fair evidence. In crimes of petty larceny, they seem to exceed their due proportion of number, but in grosser crimes, such as murder, burglary, arson, &c., they as clearly appear to fall short of it. Can this be accounted for? Yes—They are degraded, because they are trampled upon; and they are ignorant and poor, because the avenues of knowledge and wealth are extensively closed against them. As a class, they are far more "*sinned against, than sinning*." All that they want, is "*fair play*," and the elevation, acquirements and wealth to which many of their number have attained, in spite of the incubus of cruel wrong which presses on them, demonstrate how buoyantly they then would rise to a manly and generous equality with the other classes. They exceed in their proportion of petty larcenies, because they are not allowed a fair competition in honest and lucrative employments—and they are guilty of fewer atrocious crimes, because they are less ferocious, less proud, and passionate and revengeful, than others.

In many of the slave states they are prohibited from learning or being taught, to read, under heavy penalties. In some, they are excluded by law from many employments. In all the slave states, and in *the free state of Ohio*, their evidence is not allowed in courts of law. In *all* the states, *enslaved* and *free*, they are subjected variously to legal disabilities or penalties—and where law does not lend its iniquitous and cruel aid to crush and keep them down, “*public sentiment*,” an insane and ferocious prejudice, generated by tyranny, sustained by hypocrisy, and glorying in its own guilt and shame, scowls upon them with its tyrant eye, and thunders, “down, down, ye sufferers!—I am holier than thou—lie prostrate.—I indeed exclude you from light, yet I will curse you for being ignorant.—I shut you out from the most honorable and profitable employments, yet I spurn you for being poor.—I blast your brightest hopes, yet I ex-ecrate your want of enterprise.—I keep you out of office, yet I *either* blame you for not being in office, or make the danger of your rising to office should I give you fair play, a reason for my continuing to trample upon and abuse you. Away with you to Africa, the dark and heathen land, where the bold and licentious abuse of religion and liberty has not yet seared, beyond redemption, the consciences of men.—Away with you—away with you to Africa, where, in the midst of barbarian despotisms and heathen superstitions, hope beams upon you, and justice and kindness may be found; for in your native country, the United States, there is nothing before you but utter outrage and despair.”

Contemplating the class called “*free colored*,” in relation to *mind*, we have a more pleasing prospect. My materials indeed are scanty, yet scanty as they are, the secret evidence which they supply has often refreshed my heart. To behold the clear blue heavens without a cloud, is beautiful; but a buoyancy of grateful joy adds rapture to the emotion, when, amidst the wild ragings of the tempest, and the dark mustering of the clouds, heaven’s pure azure is again perceived, betokening the departing of the storm. I love to behold the smile, where all is smiles—but no smile is so sweet to me as the smile which lights up again the bosom of anguish, or which tells me of hope, where there was nought but despair.

The sky is in clouds, but the bow of promise is upon them. The evidences which I offer are as follows:

In the autumn of 1793 the yellow fever broke out in Philadelphia, with peculiar malignity. The insolent and unnatural distinctions of caste were overturned, and the people called colored, were solicited in the public papers to come forward, and assist the perishing sick. The same mouth which had gloried against them in its prosperity, in its overwhelming adversity implored their assistance: just as, were the *chivalry* of South Carolina to become cast-aways on the coasts of Africa, the bugbear horrors of the African physiognomy would be forgotten, and the *chevaliers* would be amongst the humblest supplicants of their negro lords. The colored people of Philadelphia nobly responded. The then Mayor, Matthew Clarkson, received their deputation with respect, and recommended their course. They appointed Absalom Jones and Wm. Gray to superintend it, the Mayor advertising the public that, by applying to them, aid could be obtained. This took place about September.

Soon afterwards the sickness increased so dreadfully, that it became next to impossible to remove the corpses. The colored people volunteered this painful and dangerous duty—did it extensively, and hired help in doing it. Dr. Rush instructed the two superintendents in the proper precautions and measures to be used.

A sick white man crept to his chamber window, and entreated the passers by to bring him a drink of water. Several white men passed, but hurried on. A foreigner came up—paused—was afraid to supply the help with his own hands, but stood, and offered eight dollars to whomsoever would. At length a poor black man appeared; he heard—stopped—ran for water—took it to the sick man; and then staid by him to nurse him, steadily and mildly refusing all pecuniary compensation.

Sarah Boss, a poor black widow, was active in voluntary and benevolent services.

A poor black man, named Sampson, went constantly from house to house giving assistance everywhere gratuitously, until he was seized with the fever and died.

Mary Scott, a woman of color, attended Mr. Richard Mason and his son, so kindly and disinterestedly, that the widow, Mrs. R. Mason, settled an annuity of six pounds upon her for life.

An elderly black nurse, going about most diligently and

affectionately, when asked what pay she wished, used to say "a dinner, Massa, some cold winter's day."

A young black woman was offered any price, if she would attend a white merchant and his wife. She would take no money; but went, saying that, if she went from holy love, she might hope to be preserved—but not if she went for money. She was seized with the fever, but recovered.

A black man riding through the streets, saw a white man push a white woman out of the house. The woman staggered forward, fell in the gutter and was too weak to rise. The black man dismounted, and took her gently to the hospital at Bush-hill.

Absalom Jones and Wm. Gray, the colored superintendents, say, "a white man threatened to shoot us if we passed by his house with a corpse. We buried him three days afterwards."

About twenty times as many black nurses as white, were thus employed during the sickness.

The following certificate was subsequently given by the Mayor:—

"Having, during the prevalence of the late malignant disorder, had almost daily opportunities of seeing the conduct of Absalom Jones and Richard Allen, and the people employed by them to bury the dead, I with cheerfulness give this testimony of my approbation of their proceedings, as far as the same came under my notice. The diligence, attention, and decency of deportment, afforded me at the time, much satisfaction."

(Signed) MATTHEW CLARKSON, Mayor.

Philadelphia, Jan. 23d, 1794.

In 1814, when New Orleans was in danger, and the proud and criminal distinctions of caste were again demolished by one of those emergencies in which nature puts to silence for the moment the base partialities of art, the free colored people were called into the field in common with the whites; and the importance of their services was thus acknowledged by General Jackson:—

"SOLDIERS—When, on the banks of the Mobile, I called you to take up arms, inviting you to partake the perils and glory of your white fellow-citizens, I expected much from you—for I was not ignorant that you possessed qualities most formidable to an invading enemy. I knew with what

fortitude you could endure hunger and thirst, and all the fatigues of a campaign. I knew well how you loved your native country, and that you had as well as ourselves, to defend what man holds most dear, his parents, relations, wife, children and property. You have done more than I expected. In addition to the qualities which I previously knew you to possess, I find moreover among you, a noble enthusiasm, which leads to the performance of great things.

Soldiers—The President of the United States shall hear how praiseworthy was your conduct in the hour of danger, and the representatives of the American people will, I doubt not, give you the praise which your deeds deserve. Your General anticipates them in applauding your noble ardor.

The enemy approaches—his vessels cover our lakes—our brave citizens are united, and all contention has ceased among them. Their only dispute is, who shall win the prize of valor, or who the most glory, its noblest reward."

By order, (*Signed*) THOS. BUTLER,
Aid-du-Camp.

In Philadelphia, by the census of 1830, the proportion of the free colored people to the whites, was about 1 to 9.

In the same year, a committee of the Senate of Pennsylvania, was appointed to report upon the expediency or non-expediency of enacting restrictions, upon the emigration of this class into that state. The following is an extract from the report of that committee, signed by Mr. Breck:—

"On this subject your committee beg to remark, that by the last census, our colored population amounted to about 36,000, of whom 30,000 inhabit the eastern district, and only 6000 the western. And this number, so small compared with the white population, is scattered among 1,500,000 of our own color, making 1 colored to 42 whites. So few of these, it is believed by your committee, need not at present be an object of uneasiness, and would not seem to require the enactment of any restrictive laws; more especially as they are, for the greater part, industrious, peaceable and useful people," &c.

In the same year, (1830) the whole number of out-of-door paupers, stately relieved in the city, was 549; but only 22 of these, or about 4 per-cent, were people of color. Of the paupers admitted into the almshouse the proportion was nearly the same.

In the same year, the payments by colored people
to poor funds \$2500
Expenditure for colored poor 2000

Balance paid by the colored people for help of poor
whites \$ 500

The rents paid by the colored people were upwards of
\$100,000.

They had—

Methodist meeting houses, 6	Sunday Schools, . . . 2
Presbyterian, 2	Tract Societies, . . . 2
Baptist, 2	Temperance Societies, 2
Episcopalian, 1	Female Lit. Institution, 1
Public Halls, 1	Beneficent Societies, 50

Some of these are incorporated. Of all, the members are bound to promote industry and morality; and for any breach of these rules, or for intemperance of any kind, they are liable to expulsion. These Societies raise and expend annually, upwards of \$7000 for mutual aid. No member of any of these societies, has ever been convicted in any court.

These facts, &c. may be found detailed in a memorial, which was addressed to the Legislature of Pennsylvania in Jan. 1832, in behalf of the free colored people of that State, signed by James Forten, Chairman, and by Wm. Whipple and Robt. Purvis, Secretaries.

In the city of New-York, the people called colored amount to about 20,000.

They have—Presbyterian Church, 1
Episcopalian, 1
Baptist, 2
Methodist, 7

These are not all yet provided with buildings, but they meet statedly as churches.

They have 11 city schools on the same system as the whites; five of which are supported by themselves, and have colored teachers. One of these five is called "The Phoenix," under Dr. Brown, corner of Leonard and Chapel streets, and has 100 scholars.

They have upwards of 20 benevolent institutions, male and female, for mutual aid in sickness, &c. &c.

They have 5 literary societies, of which 2 are female—and 4 libraries.

Their public property in churches, schools, &c., is valued at \$113,000.

Of the people called colored, in New Haven, Professor Silliman is reported in the *African Repository* of 1832, page 184, thus to have spoken:—

“It is delightful to see so many of our colored people living in neat and comfortable dwellings; furnished in decent taste, and sufficient fulness; thus indicating sobriety, industry and self-respect—to see their children in clean attire, hastening of a sabbath morning, to the sunday school; and on other days, with cheerful intelligent faces, seeking the common school.”

But I must pause, or you will have again to condemn me, partially at least, to repose on your “*Procrustean bed*.” More, if the Lord please hereafter. Meanwhile, ever believe me, in cordial sympathy with the oppressed every where, and their friends, your affectionate

C. STUART.

P. S.—In your 4th number (July) I find an article from your pen, on “Abstinence from the products of slave labor.” It greatly surprises and grieves me. Had I seen it in time I should immediately have reviewed it, but it came to me too late. Next quarter, if the Lord please, I shall offer you my strictures upon it.

C. STUART.

August 9th, 1836.

We welcome *light* from every quarter, but especially from such a man as the writer of the above.—Ed.

AMERICAN SLAVERY vs. HUMAN LIBERTY.

BY A KENTUCKIAN.

THE cause of Human Liberty has more to fear from *American Slavery* than from any form of political despotism.

I. The proposition will appear evident from the fact, that the present system of American Slavery is *worse in itself* than any *existing* political despotism, *i. e.* it contains the *despotic principle* in a purer state. Now it is *this principle* which is the antagonist of liberty—it is this in political des-

potisms which renders them the foes of human liberty. Like alcohol, it is a poison, however diluted or disguised; and the degree of its malign influence will depend upon the extent to which it is mingled with other ingredients. It may be, and often is in political forms, so combined with correct principles as to lose much of its malignity. But American Slavery is despotism, unalleviated by a single redeeming principle. It is despotism—soul, body and limbs—despotism, separated from every commixture, and doubly refined by the *characteristic skill of freemen!* It is the *alcohol itself*. Of course it must be more inimical to liberty than other modified forms of despotism. But to mention a few items in which it is worse than political despotism, it may be observed,

1. That other forms of despotism rarely, if ever in the present day, exist without some of the formalities of law. Tyrants are constrained to have their standards by which their subjects estimate them, and not unfrequently do their excessive usurpations incur open violence or assassination. The general diffusion of free principles has softened, more or less materially, the features of all existing despotisms—all, *save American Slavery*, which is continually growing more lawless and ferocious, *under the immediate auspices of liberty!* Long established modes of administration, forming precedents, exert a powerfully restraining influence over the despot, and tend to secure that regularity in his measures which it is one object of law to establish. But the system of slavery has no such balance-wheel. Every master makes his own will his law, and glories in his contempt of precedents. But again, should the tyrant's caprice alone be his law, the length of his reign may sometimes afford time for his subjects to learn that caprice, and adapt themselves to it; but the slave, in his frequent and sudden transfers from master to master, cannot avail himself of this poorest provision against oppression.

2. Again, political despotism recognizes the fact that the people have *rights*. Mark! I do not say that it recognizes *all* the rights of its subjects, nor that it very clearly defines any of them, nor that it always faithfully regards any one of them. I say simply, that it recognizes the *fact* that men have rights. For example, there is a sense in which it admits the right of *Property*. This is seen, not in any Declaration setting forth "this right as self-evident;" but in the

fact that it secures its subjects from the depredation of one another, and from foreign encroachments. That private property is *liable* to be wrested away by the tyrant himself, instead of being incompatible with the ground here taken, implies its truth; for the subject must have property before he can be liable to its loss. The fact then is this, that the subject of a despotism may and does acquire property, and that his property, though subject to the general disposal of the despot, is sacred against all other encroachments. The *practical* bearings of this will be shewn in another place. The point which is to be noticed here is that, with respect to property, the subject of a despotism is situated altogether differently from an American slave. The latter is himself the property of another, and of course all the products of his toil are another's property. But this inference was not left to the chance of logical deduction; it has been settled by legal enactment. "The slave," says the Louisiana code, "can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire any thing, but which *must* belong to his master." The *right of marriage* also, despotism recognizes, at least so far as seldom to invade or disturb it. In the ordinary operations of despotic government there is no occasion for breaking up the family relation. It is only when extensive wars occur that separation of families takes place, and then the separation is but short, except to the slain, and how far more desirable is *their* separation than that, in which the parties *survive*, to bleed at every pore and snap, one by one, the cords of life!—Furthermore, *personal security* is in a great measure guarantied to every subject of a despotism. The king, in most cases, can have no personal partialities, and every consideration of interest will induce him to surround his people with those defences both against foreign and domestic foes, which will secure their safety, and attach them inseparably to him. The slaveholder, on the other hand, or his overseer, with a power quite as absolute as that of the despot, has often decided inducements to abuse his slaves. With regard to *rights* then, there is a wide contrast between political despotism and American slavery. The former recognizes rights, whether from policy or principle is not the question—the latter denies *all rights*. The former will occasionally wake up a most furious tempest, in which all principle will be borne to the ground, but when the storm is past the subjects' rights lift

up their heads again. The latter, in its calmest action, tramples upon every human right. The former is like the volcano, whose irruptions are desolating indeed, but rare. The latter can be compared to nothing but the *bottomless pit, whose fires are never quenched.*

3. The despotisms of the present age are avowedly administered for *the good of the subjects.* They assume that the people are not capable of governing themselves, and that absolute despotism is most energetic and best adapted to national prosperity and defence. But American slavery hardly makes any other pretence than that, the relation between master and slave regards only the good of the master—that the slave has no good to be secured—that he is not to be reputed *capable* of happiness—that he is not a *person*, but a thing—not an end, but a means, an appendage, a piece of property, the sole value of which consists in its adaptation to advance the interests of its owner. Place these principles of American slavery side by side with those of the veriest despotism on earth, and the latter will brighten into beauty by the contrast. The very *Criminal code* of Russia or Turkey, is more humane than the slave laws of the United States!

4. But a still stronger point of contrast between American slavery and political despotism is, that the former admits an *indefinite number* of tyrants, while the latter allows but *one.* Now let it be supposed that the head of a despotic government is as entirely irresponsible, capricious and cruel as the worst slaveholder in Louisiana; yet the actual condition of his subjects would be inconceivably more happy than that of American slaves. There is a natural impossibility in the way of his perpetrating the same cruelties upon his people, that the slaveholder may easily inflict upon his victims. The immense number of subjects and the vast territory over which they spread, are a sure protection against frequent individual suffering. A single tyrant, in the midst of millions of subjects, if he should lay himself out to make his people miserable, and should employ for this purpose all the minions about his throne, could not reach one individual in a hundred with direct cruelties. To the subject there is safety in the multitude and a refuge in the crowd; there are retreats in the thick woods, in the caverns, among the rocks, or even in the *bosom of the family*, which the despot's eye never penetrates. But when we turn to American slavery

how reversed is the picture ! Here are millions indeed, but instead of a lone monarch sitting upon his throne in some corner of the vast dominions, here are rulers of tens, and rulers of fifties, and rulers of hundreds—each a complete despot. Instead of a spreading empire, with its concealments, its dark forests, and its deep recesses, opening their friendly arms to embosom the subject, we see a *plantation*, which can be surveyed at a single glance of its proprietor, and *this is the limits* of the slave. Nor is this all. Each plantation has from three to six, or more, absolute tyrants, swaying as many sceptres over it. The master and the mistress, the young masters and mistresses, the overseers and drivers—all these have despotic power and are ambitious to exert it. It will not unfrequently happen that their commands will conflict, so that it will be impossible for the slaves to obey all. Then punishment inevitably follows. Thus the wretched slave suffers incessantly, on every side, the gallings of an *omnipresent tyranny*.

From considerations such as these, it must be manifest that American slavery is more atrocious than any existing form of political despotism. Does any one doubt this ? Does any one dare to question it ? And now let it be remembered that, by so much as the former is *worse in itself* than the latter, it is by so much the *greater enemy of free principles*.

II. Human liberty has more to fear from American slavery than from any other existing form of despotism, because it is *American* slavery ; because this system, compared with which Turkish tyranny is mercy, is an American system ; because this monster of rapine and tears and blood—this arch foe of human liberty, is *our* ally—encouraged by our favor, sanctioned by our laws, sanctified by our religion, and protected by our arms ! And what has our nation done in past time ? She was the first to say, *All men are born equal*. In defence of this principle she lavished her blood and treasures, resolved to stand or fall with it, and she triumphed. She then took her trumpet and proclaimed the same truth to the world, until the nations heard and began to awake. What more has our nation done ? She has reasoned, and written, and sung and spoken about human rights—ridiculed aristocracy—denounced monarchy—anathematized despotism—eulogized liberty—declaimed about the omnipotence of truth—prophesied the downfall of thrones, and the estab-

lishment of universal freedom. All this has our nation done before the eyes and ears of the world. What more has she done? When distant nations, encouraged by her success, have sought to be free, her cheering voice has gone across the ocean; her sympathy, prayers and contributions have rolled in tides of mighty impulse toward the strugglers; and when superior force has crushed the insurgents and doomed them to a harder bondage than before, she has opened wide her gates and bid them come, "where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest." Shall I ask again, what has our nation done? Nay, rather, what has she not done to *commit* herself before the world as the champion of human liberty? So she has been regarded both by despots and their subjects, and so she is *proud* to be regarded. Her post has been assigned her at the side of the infant cause of Human Liberty, single handed and alone, and she has *gloried* to stand there and defy the world in arms. As a people, not as a government, I speak of our nation, and say, she has made this cause her cause, its enemies her enemies, its conflicts her conflicts, its victories her triumphs, its defeat her ruin. This is *one* aspect of our nation. It is noble, and makes every American proud of his country. But take *another* view. Let us ask again, what has our nation done—I mean as a people? She has invited the very demon of despotism into her bosom. She has surrendered to his fierce sway two millions and a half of her own population. She has appointed as his agents, her own citizens of every grade, from the President of the United States to "the last and lowest." Mark! all these negotiations have been, not with a disguised form of despotism, introducing itself under some flattering name, but they have been with the naked monster himself!—What more has our nation done? At the bidding of this monster, she has established marts in various parts of the land, for the sale of men. She has offered and pledged her services to stand sentinel around his dominions, both to keep down insurrections among his subjects, and to drag back to his clutches every hapless fugitive. She has made him as the apple of her eye;—watched him with the tenderest solicitude, guarded, shielded, and worshipped him. His name she will not allow to be taken in vain; his character cannot be investigated with impunity; his claims cannot be ques-

tioned without arousing her ire and periling the lives of her citizens. Dearer to her than union and national existence—more precious than liberty and law—more sacred than human rights and religion, he sits by her permission, both upon the throne and the altar, issuing his commands as law; and with the same breath demanding for an holocaust the bodies of freemen, who dare to question his authority. This is another aspect of our nation. It is horribly base, and should make every American hide his head for shame. But let us bring these two aspects of our nation together, in order that we may see more clearly the contradictions which they present. This will be a *third* view. Here it is. Our nation, the champion of liberty—the devotee of despotism! Our nation, the cradle of freedom—the foster parent of oppression! The guardian angel of every people who struggle to be free—the endorser of all despots! The asylum of the oppressed—the last retreat of the monster of despotism! The land of the *free*—the home of the *slave*! Our Capitol, the Seat of liberty—and the Fortress of despotism! Our President, the Executive of a republic—and an absolute despot! Our press, the palladium of liberty—and the *Ægis* of slavery! *This is the third aspect of our nation!* It is God-provoking, and should excite the indignation of the world. Where did the sun ever look upon such shocking paradoxes? What nation was ever involved in such shameful inconsistencies? And *such a nation* too! So high in its aims, so daring in its enterprises, so liberal in its principles, so expansive in its philanthropy, so confident in the advance of liberty, and so defiant of despotism! And are we the friends of human liberty? Friends! There is no nation on earth which *can* be so deadly a foe to liberty. We have wounded her *in the house of her friends*; we have cast the lie in her teeth; we have betrayed her with a kiss; *we* have dragged her bleeding body through our streets, until our name is a stench in every palace of despotism. Champion of liberty indeed! Where might not liberty have been this day? What new triumphs—what new trophies might she not have gained? What unfettered millions might have been raising the shout of jubilee, but for our nation's treachery? And now let me ask, what can liberty regard as her bitterest foe, if it be not that system which has thrown our nation

into such an attitude towards herself—the odious system of American slavery?

III. But the view which has most deeply impressed me, with the truth of the proposition which is the subject of this article, is this—American slavery, if it continue, *must certainly and speedily destroy our free institutions*. Here one might infer from what has been said above, that this would be the most desirable event which could occur for the cause of human liberty, and this inference would be just, if it were granted that slavery was to be perpetual in our government. But from the nature of the case this cannot be. Either slavery or the republic must conquer wholly, and that soon. If the former triumphs, it not only destroys what now pertains to the republic, but it blights all which might and would belong to the republic if *itself* had triumphed. The influence of a pure republican government—the power of her principles—the majesty of her example—these are involved in the ruin, and are of course to be taken into the estimate of the mischief done to human liberty. Viewed in this light, the destruction of our republic would be most disastrous. The cause of liberty would receive a shock from which it would probably not recover for many years—not to say centuries. It is evident that there is no way to save our government and render it permanent, but by *constant* resistance to the spirit of despotism—a spirit whose nature and essence is hostility to free institutions. We should repel its first approaches, reject its alliance, dread its smile, suspect it under the fairest disguises, and always, every where, and in every shape, reprobate it as the deadliest foe of republicanism. It is believed that Americans estimate these truths, so far as they relate to foreign despotisms, and are prepared to resist all anti-republican influences from abroad—excepting always those of Popery. So jealous are we about *foreign interference* that, let but an Englishman come amongst us, and propose to discuss publicly our own institutions, and at once the outcry is raised—he is an emissary commissioned by despotism to fire the temple of liberty. But the same considerations which call for the exercise of vigilance towards foreign influences, apply with an hundred-fold power to *that despotism* which is in our midst; and yet what is the state of the public mind with regard to the latter? No concern about its existence

here—no suspicion of its character—not even so much as a misgiving that it has any tendency to sap the foundations of the government—nay, it is matter of serious debate whether it be not “the corner stone of republicanism!” It is surely time that Americans should investigate the precise bearings of slavery upon our free institutions—that we should fully understand both the manner in which it endangers them and the imminency of the danger. It will not require great research to see that all the combined power of Europe’s aristocracies, monarchies, and despotisms, cannot do one tenth part as much to subvert our liberties as our own system of domestic slavery. In proof of this take a few simple facts. 1, There is more of rank despotism in the latter, than in all the former together. This has already been illustrated in another connection. If the less therefore is to be dreaded, is the more altogether harmless? If that which is almost neutralized by combination with opposite principles, is still to be proscribed, shall the unadulterated essence be regarded as safe? If not, then we must draw the contrary conclusion, and infer, that our system of slavery is the most dangerous enemy which our government has in the world.

2. This most formidable enemy has all the additional advantages for ruining us, which accrue from his being in the midst of our institutions. Having effectually secured our confidence, he has free access to our most secret designs. He is thoroughly acquainted with our national plans, with the weak points of our republic, and with the instrumentalities by which we may be most easily influenced. His actual power to influence is proportionably great. He sways dominion over the fairest portions of our land. He has a seat in our Capitol. He regulates a large department of our internal commerce—called the American Slave trade. He patronizes our colleges, controls our presses, directs us in the subjects which we may talk about. He has also a superintendence over our churches, and pulpits, and theological seminaries, and publishes *the only authentic commentary upon the Bible*. In addition to this, he has so wound himself about our affections that we are ready to make any sacrifice in order to secure his favor. If he complains, we annihilate law and beckon on the mob to riot over private property. If this will not satisfy him, we drag our fellow-

citizens to the public square, and shamefully scourge their naked bodies. If this will not do, we demolish the press, and rifle the sanctuary of God. If all these sacrifices will not appease his wrath, *we threaten to dissolve the union*. Here then is our greatest enemy in our midst, possessing every advantage of position, confidence and affection, and incessantly infusing his poison into our free institutions. If my countrymen any longer allow their suspicions to sleep on this subject, while they keep up the show of vigilance towards foreign despotisms—if, I say, they suffer the serpent to lie coiled in their very bosom, while they start at a reptile's hiss coming from beyond the ocean—then indeed is there reason to fear that they are smitten with that infatuation which precedes destruction. If suspicion is not awakened speedily, our liberties are lost forever.

But 3. It is an appalling fact, that the circumstances which surround American slavery are calculated to disarm us of all suspicion! Several of these circumstances I will beg leave to mention.

1st. This system of slavery exists *in* a free government, and is itself one of the institutions of a free people. Why then should we suspect it? every one might exclaim. It is intimately associated with the genius of liberty—how can it be “a monster of such horrid mien?” It is sanctioned by our laws and protected by our constitution—can it be the nullifier of all law and constitutions? It is the very cement of our union, insomuch, that if it be removed, it is said the union will be at once dissolved—can it be the enemy of our government? Incredible! If it were, it would not be harbored for a moment, much less would it be elevated to a conspicuous rank among the institutions of our land. Such is the conclusion to which the mass of minds would readily come. To this conclusion the whole nation have come, and now they cry with one acclaim, “Away with suspicion—away with suspicion”—while the monster is silently sapping the foundation of our government!

2nd. This same system of slavery existed at the time when our government was formed; and yet the formers of our government, those wise and patriotic republicans, did not denounce it; nay, they were, many of them, slaveholders themselves! The very men who declared, at the peril of “their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honors,” that

"all men were born equal, and were endowed by nature with inalienable right to liberty"—were slaveholders! And the same men transmitted slavery, a joint inheritance with liberty, to their children! Now is there any thing in all this which proves slavery to be the enemy of our republic? Rather does not every thing conspire to make even the suspicion of such a thing sacrilegious? The reader will see at once how powerful must be the operation of this reflection. It is by no means confined to the unthinking, but affects the most intelligent. It seizes directly upon that veneration for the Revolutionary heroes, which is one of the strongest feelings in the American bosom, and in this manner sways many minds which would otherwise detect its shallow sophistry.

3rd. This system of slavery has been ever since the Revolution, and is now practised by the very men who manifest the greatest devotion to liberty. Look at the facts. Who are best qualified to be Presidents?—*Slaveholders*. Who talk the loudest in Congress about our mighty republic?—*Slaveholders*. Who write the most eloquently about our glorious institutions?—*Slaveholders*. Who celebrate the 4th of July with the greatest patriotism and parade?—*Slaveholders*. Who devote most of their time to eulogizing liberty in our bar-rooms and *other* temples of freedom?—*Slaveholders*. And what inference are we to draw from all these facts? What, but that slaveholding fosters republican feelings, and consequently that domestic slavery is "an essential element in a free government?" It is true that Dr. Johnson, with keenest irony, exclaims, "How is it that we hear the loudest yelps for liberty among the drivers of negroes!" It is true also that the celebrated Burke declared, "that masters would, even more than other men, be attached to freedom, because with them it was not merely a right and a blessing, but a privilege and a distinction." But then it is known that Johnson was a monarchist, and Burke also, and what motive could they have had for assailing our favorite system, unless it was the malicious desire to stab our free institutions.

But here the question returns, shall we be alarmed about the tendencies of slavery, when our wisest politicians, and statesmen, and editors, are slaveholders? When in addition to this, those who stand next below the slaveholders in

the scale of patriotism, viz.: our northern politicians, statesmen and editors, et id omne genus, are the staunch defenders of domestic slavery? Would it not appear from such facts that actual slaveholding, where it is practicable, and at least, the pro-slavery spirit, is indispensable to the perfection of the republican spirit? Then, when we cast our eye upon the opposers of slavery, the alarmists, who are endeavoring to draw public odium upon the system—why, they are a mere handful of weak, pious fanatics, run mad about abstract rights, headed by a little knot of knavish christian conspirators, whose aim is to unite church and state, or to transform our glorious republic into an absolute despotism. This is evidence enough. “Down with the incendiaries, away with suspicion—liberty and slavery forever!” and the thundering plaudit reverberates through all the land. The South cries “all is peace”—and the North responds “all is peace”—and though the gathering wrath of God replies, “no peace,” yet the nation hears it not. Such is a picture of our country. The enemy is wide awake, but we are asleep. His dark and covert ruin steals rapidly on, yet we have no suspicions! Soon the foundation will be gone—soon the pillars will tremble—and the republic—my countrymen, take *the alarm!*

I have now stated a few circumstances which tend to disarm the American people of all suspicion respecting their own system of slavery; and I have reiterated what the inevitable consequences must be.

4. I proceed to notice the fact, that free discussion in the non-slaveholding states on the subject of slavery, is in the same manner discouraged and smothered. I allude here, not to those direct obstacles which slaveholders and violent pro-slavery men, throw in the way of discussion; but to certain opinions, erroneous in fact, yet honestly entertained by northern mind, and by which, more than by all the anathemas of slaveholders and their apologists, the free states are deterred from the discussion of the slavery question. It needs only to be mentioned that discussion is necessary—discussion among northern communities, and *must precede* the full developement of the anti-republican tendencies of slavery. Whatever therefore discourages the public mind from the discussion of this subject, tends to perpetuate slavery, and all the consequent evils which have been already

pointed out. I shall be better understood by mentioning some of the false opinions alluded to above, as deterring the people of the free states from discussing, or in any way interesting themselves, in the question of slavery.

1st. The northern states originally formed a *compact* with the South, by which they obligated themselves to refrain from all interference with slavery. It will be perceived that it does not enter into my plan at present, to refute these sentiments. I am to show how their existence will tend to smother free discussion. I shall therefore assume them to be erroneous. If it be believed that the North has made such a compact, then in order to observe good faith it would seem that they should say nothing about slavery, but leave it wholly to the South. If the North is debarred from all action in the case, then of course discussion is useless, and the Yankees had better spend their breath in some more profitable way. Many from this simple consideration, make a matter of conscience of it to "touch not, handle not," nor even so much as think gravely of the subject, for fear they should become excited and break their covenant with the slaveholders.

2nd. Slavery is a very intricate subject. A thousand interests are at stake. The master's safety, and the security of his family, the quiet of community, commercial, manufacturing, and agricultural interests, in a word, all the interests of all the country, and the welfare of the slave besides—are involved in the slavery question. The profoundest minds of our nation have been turned to this subject; but they have not been able to solve the difficulty. Hence every one recoils from the slavery question. The South love to have their system invested with mystery, and they assure the country that no one can know any thing about slavery but the slaveholders. The people of the North acquiesce and say, "better leave the whole matter with our brethren of the South." Vast numbers are deterred from discussion on this ground.

3d. Slavery is a very delicate matter. It is more dangerous than a thousand powder magazines. Hands off. It must not be touched, lest it should explode and blow the Union into atoms. Many there are who would as soon carry a blazing torch through a powder mill, as to discuss the slavery question.

4th. If slavery is discussed and written about, the agitation will reach the slaves and cause insurrections. Love therefore for the generous people of the South, constrains the North to abstain from discussion.

5th. Slavery is a *domestic institution*, just as family government or household management. *It is none of our business therefore*, the North concludes, and common courtesy requires that we should be silent about it, however much we may dislike the system. We should at least refrain from any interference, until our aid is solicited. In this way the soundest statesmen, and the greatest divines reason. The same sentiment will be found every where through the North, and it serves as an effectual quietus to discussion.

6th. Slavery is a political question. What then? Why of course ministers must not discuss it; the church too must steer clear of it, lest forsooth she lose her spirituality. As for females, they must not even so much as think of slavery, seeing it is wholly unbecoming their sex to know any thing about political questions. Furthermore *northern* politicians must not intermeddle with slavery, for it belongs exclusively to *southern politics*. Of course the common people, both North and South, should avoid the question, for they are not versed in the subtleties of political controversy. So then it is reduced to this—that Southern politicians are the only persons in the world who have any right to discuss the merits of American slavery! And yet, ridiculous as this is, it is extensively believed! Ministers excuse themselves on this principle, and the church overlooks unparalleled wrong and steels her heart against the Lord's poor, on the same flimsy pretext. Such are the difficulties which stare the mass of northern men in the face, and compel them to refrain from discussion, just as they would shrink from treason. Honest mistakes on these points have doubtless in many cases been the remote cause of that bitter opposition to discussion, which has manifested itself in mob violence.

It must be evident that, if slavery be a dangerous element in a free government, *its danger is increased an hundred fold*, from the obstacles which lie in the way of the free discussion and fair understanding of its tendencies. If American slavery were only discussed fully by northern communities, our country would have nothing to fear; but that a most wonderful combination of circumstances should con-

spire to smother all discussion, is alarming and ominous to the republic.

5. The reader will bear with me, while I mention finally, one peculiar feature of American Slavery, which, while it operates equally with the things already specified, to *lull suspicion* and *smother discussion*, also tends to reconcile the nation to all the horrid deformities of the system. I refer to that prevailing prejudice which is felt toward the enslaved. This prejudice, which regards both *the color* and *the condition* of the slave, is as strong as it is extensive. It is considered by the great mass of the community, both North and South, to be natural, and it is declared to be utterly invincible. With this question I have nothing to do here. My object is to show how the prevalence of this prejudice enhances the danger to which our country is exposed from slavery. Our feelings with regard to any evil, will depend almost entirely upon our feelings towards those who suffer the evil. If we admire the sufferer, we abhor the occasion of the suffering, if it be in its nature blameworthy. If we despise the victim of wrong we shall be disposed to tolerate, if not to approve, the wrong. In this way *oppression itself*, and that too, of the most atrocious character, may change grounds in our estimation. For example, when the Greeks contended for freedom, why did every American bosom burn with indignation against their Turkish oppressors? Because we remembered the glory of the Grecian name, admired the descendants of Homer, Demosthenes, and Leonidas, and sympathized with them in their sufferings. Had the case been reversed, and had the barbarous Turk been struggling against the oppressions of the classic Greek, American feeling, would, in all probability, have been wholly different. All our associations would have led us to sympathize with the oppressor, and connive at the oppression. Now observe the common feeling in this country towards the slaves. We hate their persons, both for their own degradation, and that of their ancestry, and still more because of their color. Of course we disregard their rights and their interests, and we not unfrequently doubt whether they were not *made to be slaves*. Our sympathies are with the master—none flow for the slave. We feel more concern for the purse of the former, than we do for the body and soul of the latter. With such feelings as these, what will be our judgment concerning the

oppression itself under which the slave lives? How great is the liability—nay how certain are we to love that oppression, though it be the very principle against which all our institutions and prejudices are arrayed! Such is our attitude now, and such our imminent danger of becoming *friendly to the principle of oppression!*

What an admirable manœuvre! that despotism, in meditating an assault upon our republic, should make his first attack upon a despised class! In no other way could he have eluded the vigilance of republicans, so as to effect an entrance, and to establish himself amongst them. Now he has time and opportunity to lay out all his plans, and perfect his infernal machinery for the destruction of our liberties, without being once suspected, or incurring the slightest investigation into his designs. He comes, too, openly, and enlists every prejudice in his favor; for he comes to take the management of a class, who never can be admitted to the immunities of free government. He brings with him all the insignia of his power—whips, auction hammers, chains, bolts and bars—and he is not afraid to hang them up to the public gaze, for they are only for the benefit of the black population. Behind him comes his sooty train of attendants—starvation, nakedness, ignorance, woe, licentiousness and heathenism; but no matter, so long as their dispensation is confined to the *black population*. Meanwhile the American mind is becoming *familiarized* with the features of the monster, and *this is the very thing which he wishes!* To this end he makes his operations as public as possible. He selects the capitol of the nation as the seat of his principal markets. There he builds his factories and dungeons, and if possible he secures the use of the *United States Prison*. For the same purpose of publicity, he marches his victims, by hundreds, chained and handcuffed, over the whole breadth of the land, from Maryland to Georgia. With the same end in view, he repeatedly transports his freight by steam-boats, taking care to select the most crowded vessel with its full share of *northern* passengers, and embarking if possible, from the most public point. All this is done in the broad glare of daylight, to habituate the American eye to the machinery of despotism. In the mean time there are no counteracting influences—no general outcry against these abominations—no summoning of the energies of truth to

repel them. The necessary result is, the public mind is becoming more and more reconciled to the principles of despotism. American hostility is moderating, and the prejudices and habits of the community are conforming—gradually indeed, and almost imperceptibly, save to the practiced eye of the monster himself. The grand manœuvre is working wonderfully. A little more *familiarity* with Despotism will lead to *friendship for him*. A little longer *toleration*, will terminate in *admiration*—and THEN, *white* American citizens will be ready to have the yoke placed upon *their* necks, and the fetters fastened on their limbs. Then the catastrophe will have come—the consummation of the monster's plans—and *a slavery more atrocious than Turkish Despotism will reign over the countrymen of Washington!*

Let no one who is convinced of the correctness of this representation, persuade himself, nevertheless, that the day of so awful a catastrophe is remote. Rather let us examine the signs of the times, and see whether destruction be not even at our door! Let us look into past events, and see if the steps detailed above, *all save the last*, have not already been taken. What are some of the facts of every day occurrence?

1st. The populace are set above the law. By what authority? Their own? Nay, verily, but by the deliberately expressed opinion of Congressmen, Senators, Governors, and Judges. Who does not know that this is a monstrous departure from long established principles of government? Here is one step!

2d. The prominent feature of republicanism is obscured. What is that? *Protection of human rights*. This principle has fallen into the back ground, and *protection of domestic slavery* has taken its place. About *this* centre, the politics, patriotism, morality and religion of the country revolve. *Another step!*

3d. *True devotion* to liberty has been exchanged for miserable prating about it. Time was when liberty was a *good in itself*, for the securing of which no sacrifice was too great. Now it is a good only as connected with slavery. Formerly it was a something which could be felt and enjoyed, far better than it could be talked of. Now it dwells on the lip, rather than in the heart. Fulsome adulation and hollow hearted flattery compose the devotions which are paid to liberty.

Instance, Fourth of July speeches, Liberty meetings, pro-Texas, and anti-abolition meetings in concert.* *Another step !*

4th. The right of petition is legislated away, and the Press is silent. Proof—Pinckney's resolutions in Congress : *Another step !*

5th. Our nation has deserted the cause of Human Liberty—a cause which sprung into being with her, and was borne widely abroad by her sympathies and prayers. With the eyes of the world upon her, our nation has *backed out from this cause*, and given herself up to the prosecution of selfish purposes, and to idle gasconading about her superiority to other nations. *Another step !*

6th. Free discussion and the liberty of the Press—the foundation of the Republic—are virtually annihilated by being surrendered to the control of mobocratic caprice. *Another step !*

7th. The practicability of Republicanism is extensively questioned by the high and low. Sure indication that they are becoming tired of the present form of government, and wish to try some form more in unison with their favorite system of slavery. *Another step !*

8th. The Union is no longer the common object of political veneration, upon whose altar local interests, sectional feelings, and state jealousies, are to be laid. *Slavery* is the idol, and union the appointed sacrifice to be offered up whenever demanded. The sentiment is no longer "Liberty and Union," but "Slavery first and Union afterwards." *Another step !*

9th. And last.—The first truth *that all men should be free*, is boldly denied.

* I quote the following from the Cincinnati Journal and Luminary, together with the comments of the Editor, as a striking illustration of the mouthing, inconsistent, hypocritical republicanism of the present day :

"At a meeting held in this city last month, in favor of Texas, the following resolutions, moved by N. C. Read Esq., were adopted :

"That we regard every war designed for the subversion of tyranny, and the establishment of liberty, as a *holy* war, entitled to the strong sympathy and ardent support of every freeman.

"That all laws international or domestic, having a tendency to enslave mankind, or any portion of the human family, are unnatural, a libel upon heaven, and being instruments enacted 'by tyrants' for their own benefit, ought not to be recognized by freemen, as an obstacle preventing them from lending their assistance to the Texans, or any other people struggling for liberty."

The above resolutions were sustained by an address from the Hon. R. T. Lytle, who made an address at the anti-abolition meeting in this city. We hardly know how to reconcile principles so widely variant.

What shameless assertions—what shocking doctrines—what monstrous theories, have not appeared within the last one or two years ! The Declaration of Independence has been called, a “Rhetorical Flourish.” Slavery has been styled “The corner stone of the Republican Edifice”—“an essential element in a free Government.” The laboring classes “bleached and unbleached,” have been doomed to slavery *for the public good*. The poor it is said must be governed by a *system of force*. Even prophecy has been essayed, and it is gravely augured that so soon as the institutions of the northern states become settled on their permanent basis, they will be slaveholding states, and this, it is said will most probably take place “before a quarter of a century.”

The very pillars of liberty have been violently assailed ! The old basis of equal rights, which our fathers layed beneath the Republic, is now to be removed, in order that domestic slavery may be substituted. And by whom has this been done ? By our most prominent statesmen. Such doctrines have issued from the halls of Congress. And how have they been received ? Let the silence of the Press answer—let the insensibility of the people answer. *Another step !*

And here pause, my countrymen, ere you take *another step*, for that may be your *last*.

I speak to those who still love the cause of human liberty, be they few or many, and *many* they are even yet I trust. To all such, who love to anticipate the disenthralment of mankind, and expect their country to move forward in this glorious enterprise—to all such I say, let us array our moral forces, and rally about the falling standard of freedom in our own country. Let us proclaim a war against despotism, every where, but especially in our own republic. Let us drag out the monster from his refuge in our holy temple of Liberty. Let us expose his horrid deformities. Let us raise the note of *alarm* in the ears of our slumbering nation, and reason, remonstrate, beseech and startle them, until they come up to our help, and expel the spirit of despotism from our shores. Then, and not till then, shall we spread the rapid victories of human liberty over distant nations, and conquer the world.

THE CHURCH CARRIED ALONG; OR, THE OPINIONS
OF A D.D. ON SLAVERY.

BY REV. BERAH GREEN, PRESIDENT OF ONEIDA INSTITUTE.

CHARGED as they are with being ignorant, rash, and headlong, the abolitionists are at length furnished with a guide. And a guide too, of such pretensions and of such a reputation! No less a master than the late REV. JOHN H. RICE, D.D., *Professor of Christian Theology in Union Theological Seminary, Virginia*, backed by the authority of the *Christian Spectator*. It would not, we think, be easy to find among southern clergymen, living or dead, a name equally honored—an authority equally weighty and powerful. Those, who wish to know how and why he came to have so high a place in the esteem and confidence of his fellow-christians may, if they choose, consult the reviews of his memoirs in the *Christian Spectator*, and in the *Literary and Theological Review*.

In this paper we would devote some attention to his views of the subject of American Slavery. These are contained in a letter of his to William Maxwell, Esq., and introduced in the *Christian Spectator* with the following paragraph;

“His views on the delicate and difficult subject of *slavery*, many of our readers may wish to learn. And it will not be out of place, perhaps, at the present time, when this subject is undergoing so vigorous a discussion, to give them. As a Virginian, educated amid the associations and under the many influences of this strong feature in the laws and the social economy of his native section of country, his views on this subject are, perhaps, as enlightened and liberal as from the nature of the case they could be expected to be. We are not quite sure, that, when they are looked upon in their application to the existing state of things at this moment, and with all the advantage of our position as northern men, they are not both just and important.” It is immediately added; “The following remarks are extracted from a letter to William Maxwell, Esq.:—

“I am most fully convinced that slavery is the greatest evil in our country, except whiskey; and it is my most ardent prayer that we may be delivered from it. But it is my full belief that the deliverance is not to be accomplished by the

combination of benevolent societies. The great body of persons composing such societies are too little accustomed to calculate consequences. They go directly at their measure, and have no means of accomplishing it but the producing, by means of speeches and addresses, a strong excitement. But on a subject of this delicate character, where much opposition is to be encountered, these very means give the adversary an advantage, which he will not fail to use to the injury, perhaps to the destruction of the society. While, therefore, I do most devoutly wish success to the Colonization Society, I do earnestly wish that its friends may not refer to it as a means of deliverance from slavery. Should that success which I hope for, crown the efforts of this association, the existence of a prosperous colony on the western coast will of itself do more for the cause of emancipation, than all that any, or all of us, now can effect by speaking of these things. So fully am I convinced of this, that I deplore every movement that raises any thing like opposition to the society.

The reason why I am so strenuously opposed to any movement by the church or the ministers of religion on this subject, is simply this. I am convinced that any thing we can do will injure religion, and retard the march of public feeling in relation to slavery. I take the case to be just this: as slavery exists among us, the only possible chance of deliverance is by *making the people willing* to get rid of it. At any rate, it is this or physical force. The problem to be solved is, to produce that state of the *public will*, which will cause the people to move spontaneously to the eradication of the evil. Slaves by law are held as property. If the church or the minister of religion touches the subject, it is touching what are called the rights of property. The jealousy among our countrymen on this subject is such, that we cannot move a step in this way, without wakening up the strongest opposition, and producing the most violent excitement. The whole mass of the community will be set in motion, and the great body of the church will be carried along. Under this conviction, I wish the ministers of religion to be convinced that there is nothing in the New Testament which obliges them to take hold of this subject directly. In fact, I believe that it never has fared well with either church or state, when the church meddled with temporal affairs. And I should—knowing how unmanageable religious feeling is, when not kept under the immediate influence of divine truth—be exceedingly afraid to see it brought to bear *directly* on the subject of slavery. Where the movement might end, I could not pretend to conjecture.

But I tell you what I wish. While we go on minding our own business, and endeavoring to make as many good christians as possible among masters and servants, let the subject of slavery be discussed in the political papers, reviews, &c., as a question of political economy. Keep it entirely free from all ecclesiastical connections, and from all the politics of the general government; and treat it as a matter of state concernment. Examine its effects on the agriculture, commerce and manufactures of the state. Compare the expense of free and slave labor. Bring distinctly before the people the evil in its unavoidable operations and its fearful increase. Set them to calculating the weight of their burdens. Let them see how many old slaves, and young slaves, who produce no thing, they have to support. Show them how slavery deducts from the military force as well as the wealth of a country, &c. &c. Considerations of this sort, combined with

the benevolent feelings growing out of a gradual, uninterrupted progress of religion, will, I believe, s t the people of their own accord to seek deliverance. They will foresee the necessity of a change; soon begin to prepare for it; and it will come about without violence or convulsion. Such is my opinion.'” pp. 306—308.

Dr. Rice then had the strongest conviction, that excepting intemperance, slavery was the greatest evil in our country. We shall not dispute its claims to such an unenviable distinction. It seizes a child of God; mars the divine image which had been impressed upon him; puts him among “goods and chattels,” and disposes of him as if he had been reduced to a piece of property. It lays his “life, liberty, and happiness” at the feet of any creature, who has a heart hard enough and a purse long enough, to buy him. It blights his intellect; blasts his honor; treads out his soul. This it has done—this it is still doing, for millions within our republic and among our churches;—*for millions* of sufferers, who are not allowed the poor privilege of giving free utterance to their sighs and groans and tears. In doing this, moreover, it is debauching the morals, disgracing the name, trampling upon the constitution and laws, and destroying the prospects of no less a nation than the United States! What an evil, then, must slavery be!

“I am most fully convinced,” declared Dr. Rice, “that slavery is the greatest evil in our country except whiskey.” But what *sort* of evil did our theological professor think it was? Did he regard it as a calamity or as a crime? As a misfortune or as a sin? Nothing can be more important here than just discrimination and accurate definition. A misfortune may be to be deplored and submitted to; but sin never. It is always and immediately to be repented of and abandoned. To our brethren who are under the pressure of calamity, it is our privilege to offer our heart-felt condolence; our fellow sinners are entitled to reproof, and to our assistance in breaking the “bonds of iniquity.” How then did Dr. Rice regard the evil of slavery? This inquiry may be fairly settled in the light of the hints, which he suggests. In the first place, then, let us mark the class of evils in which he gives slavery a place. At the head of it we find *intemperance*. Was drunkenness in the eye of Dr. Rice, a misfortune or a sin? It opens a flood-gate, through which misfortunes rush, doubtless. This is an office which sin is

always commissioned to perform; and which it does perform with fearful fidelity and terrible effect. Moral evil may always be expected to open the way for physical. Those who sin must suffer. But surely it cannot be rash to presume, that Dr. Rice would pronounce it wicked for any man to intoxicate himself with "whiskey." The evil of intemperance, we cannot doubt, was with him a *moral evil*. With intemperance he ranks slavery. Not only does he assign it to the same class; he also gives it a marked prominency there. It has the second place. It stands "next to the head;"—near enough to inhale the fetid breath of its swollen neighbor. In the next place, Dr. Rice makes the prevalence of slavery to depend upon the "*public will*." "The problem to be solved is," as he informs us, "to produce that state of the *public will*, which will cause the people to move spontaneously to the eradication of the evil." The great thing to be attempted in the abolition of slavery is, according to him and in his words, to "make the *people willing* to get rid of it." But what can that evil be, whose prevalence depends upon the *human will*? What sort of evils are they, which vanish whenever "the people are willing to get rid" of them? Are they hurricanes, and plagues, and broken bones? No, no. Dr. Rice knew—every man knows, that they are *sins*. When *moral evils* are to be "got rid" of—when wicked habits are to be broken up, then the very problem which Dr. Rice presents, is to be disposed of. Then "that state of the *public will* must be produced, which will cause" transgressors "to move spontaneously to the eradication of the evil." In the light, then, in which Dr. Rice exhibits slavery, we cannot hesitate to pronounce it a *SIN*—one of the *greatest* sins which disgraces and afflicts our country. And as such, if he understood the import of his own language, he must from the "fullest convictions" have been ready to pronounce it—"sin."

Yet Dr. Rice would not have "benevolent societies" meddle with slavery. He was "exceedingly afraid"—we quote his own words—"to see RELIGIOUS FEELINGS brought to bear *directly*" upon this subject! Let us see what were his objections.

His first objection "to the combination of benevolent societies" to deliver the nation from the evil of slavery, is to be found in the *directness* of their exertions. "They go," says

the Doctor, "directly at their measure." By this we understand that they fix their eyes full upon their object—distinctly and carefully survey it—adopt such measures as are best adapted to accomplish it; and like frank, honest, fearless men, announcing their intentions, go about their work. They thus choose a path strongly marked by the foot prints of their Lord and his Apostles. This the Doctor thinks is not the best way to contend with one of "the greatest evils in our country." He could not think so, and remain what he claimed to be, an ardent friend to the scheme of the American Colonization Society. Nothing could be more *indirect* than the exertions of that organization to break up the system of American slavery. Such a thing was not even proposed by the supporters of that scheme. Not a few of them were themselves slaveholders. They impudently claimed, and stoutly held, the right of property in their fellow men. They never dreamed, living or dying, of striking the chains from the limbs of their own vassals; much less of urging on the petty tyrants around them the doctrine and the duty of emancipation. And such men held the highest offices, and exerted the leading influences in this pseudo-benevolent society. So far were they from expecting in it any direct means for the abolition of slavery, that they seem to have regarded it as a shield to protect the hydra. Others—and perhaps Dr. Rice belonged to this class—seem to have hoped, that in some inconceivable, inexplicable, roundabout way, the *expatriation of the free* would open the door for the *enfranchisement of the enslaved*! And if, at some shining point, midway perhaps between now and never, their plan might take effect and ensure success, they saw no cause for discontent or discouragement. And then what a happy method! Nobody's claim to property in human flesh disputed! Nobody's crimes assailed! Nobody's prejudices aroused! Nobody's passions inflamed! Thus by humoring in the oppressor "the lust of the eye, and the lust of the flesh, and the pride of life," these sentiments and habits, gradually becoming weaker, would at length, of their own accord, let go of the heart in which they had been cherished! Could such a plan succeed, the devil, that old hunter, who has for many ages been busy at work setting traps for others, would for the first time, be himself entrapped—and entrapped by those who would thus outwit him in wiliness, and outdo him in trickery!

But benevolent societies, the Doctor tells us, "*are little accustomed to calculate consequences.*" They lack that slight of hand, by which our great magicians force the future to give up its secrets. On great moral questions, involving elemental principles and first truths, they lack that adroitness which might enable them by balancing probabilities, to guess at obligations ! How poorly qualified must they not be, to aid in removing "one of the greatest evils in the country !"

There is a way, to be sure, in which those who know not how by the doctrine of expediency to *juggle* sin out of the human heart, foresee with prophetic certainty, and proclaim with prophetic confidence the consequences of evil doing. God in shedding the light of reason upon their understandings, and in opening their eyes upon the page of Revelation, has furnished them with *the principles* upon which His government proceedeth. Through those principles a flood of sunbeams is poured upon the future ; and a child, if his eye be single, may clearly see what must result from obedience or disobedience to the laws under which human nature is placed. Conformity to these laws must be as practicable and useful as it is obligatory. To invade human rights in any way and under any pretext is to transgress these laws, and incur the penalties by which they are sanctioned. And as slavery is a most flagrant violation of these rights, it must bring after it the most dreadful consequences. To restore to the wronged their rights, must be followed with good results. No man can doubt this without stifling his own nature. Before opening his lips to deny it, he must close his eyes against the light of reason, and turn away from the inspired volume. Foulter blasphemy was never heard than he utters, who ventures to affirm *that it can be hurtful to any good cause to reduce strict rectitude to practice !* So every truly benevolent society believes, and while in contending with any evil, though second only to "whiskey" in magnitude, they hold on their way along the line of rectitude, they cheerfully give over the calculation of chances to those jugglers, political and ecclesiastical, who now amuse, and now scare, the multitude around them with their wonder-working rod. No man ever betakes himself under the pressure of evil to the fortune-teller, till he has fallen out with reason and the Bible. The king of Israel would never have gone to the witch of Endor, if he had not felt that Je-

hovah had forsaken him. Poor man ! If he had been content to obey God without calculating consequences, he could never have been driven to such shifts.

What good have *they* done us, who, "accustomed to such things," have been "calculating consequences" for the benefit of this nation ? At the close of the war of the revolution, how powerfully did not a thousand things press upon us the claims of the American negro ! Freedom had led us through a struggle, which had well nigh exhausted our strength, and consumed our resources. In that struggle, the negro had a far deeper interest than his white brethren. Chains a thousand fold heavier, hung upon his limbs. Tho' bruised and crushed by our hands, he gave us his sympathies, and "came up to our help." And when the shouts of victory broke upon his ears ; O, with what imploring looks did he not urge upon us the demand, "am I not a man and a brother ?" What could have steeled our hearts to such an appeal ! Ah, what was it ? What grim fiend stifled the yearnings of nature within us, and closed our ears to the voice of God ? Instead of doing what in their inmost hearts, they felt to be right and good, the patriots of this nation fell to "calculating consequences." As the result of this cruel process, they had the assurance to tell their suppliant brother, that though he had assisted them in stripping off their chains, they had found it expedient to rivet his upon his limbs ! And they quieted themselves and the nation, by insinuating the hope, that in process of time, these chains, though every link was made of iron, would gradually rot away and disappear. And so the republic was founded on an expedient, which gave up one sixth of the nation, to the cupidity, lust, and cruelty, of the rest ! This piece of state policy has been regarded by our self-complacent, and boastful countrymen, as a striking proof of the wisdom of our political patriarchs. What an ingenious expedient to harmonize jarring interests ! And every body's welfare provided for, except that of a few thousand helpless creatures, who were to be sacrificed to national prejudice and national avarice, and whose tears and blood might cement the glorious Union ! But God "taketh the wise in their own craftiness." What already have been the results of this laying myriads of human victims on the altar of state policy ? In the church, human cunning has to a fearful extent usurped the place of divine wisdom. Expe-

diency has seized upon the throne of rectitude. Under its sway the national heart has become lamentably corrupt. Those who are "set for the defence of the gospel," the appointed guardians of the public morals, are seen in great numbers following those whom they ought to guide; caressing those whom they should rebuke; floating passively down the stream, which they ought to stem. As might well have been expected, the monster whom ruler and subjects, priest and people, had conspired to fatten with negro blood, eager and insatiate, now opens his jaws and clamors for white victims. Expediency seconds his demands, and declares that he must not be denied. Better glut his maw with unnumbered victims, than tempt his rage and expose "the Union" to his snaky folds! And so the rights of white freemen as well as black bondmen, have been vilely set at nought. They have been insulted, mocked, and murdered with impunity. American citizens are counted exiles and outlaws in their own country. The fat priest and the supple statesman, with the man of learning and the man of fashion, and the man of wealth, have joined in a conspiracy with the ignorant, the debauched, and the desperate, to crush every one who may dare to call in question the divine right of slaveholding. Thus our country is forced to the very verge of ruin. And the very expedient, which worldly wisdom, at the expence of truth, and righteousness, and humanity, employed to form our vaunted Union, has already opened the way for its dissolution! What thanks must we not owe to those, who, in the language of Dr. Rice, are "accustomed to calculate consequences!"

Dr. Rice had a great dread of enlisting "the religious feeling" in the struggle with slavery, on account of its *unmanageableness*. He was not alone. Not a few, both at the South and at the North, have the same sentiment. They seem to be aware that if impelled by their "religious feeling," christians enter on the examination of the nature and bearings of American slavery, nothing can so "manage" them out of their reason, consciences, and hearts, as to put them asleep amidst such abominations as prevail around them. "The love of Christ will constrain them" to "remember those who are in bonds as bound with them;" to recognize in them the accredited representative of their Saviour. Thus affected, no "benevolent society" could relax its efforts till slavery

was swept from the face of all the earth. This matter has been familiar to the thoughts of such champions as oppression has found in Duff Green, and his reverend coadjutors at Princeton.

What wonder, then, that our theological and ecclesiastical "managers" should exert themselves so strenuously to get ahead of the "religious feeling." If they fail here they seem to be aware that all is lost to the "patriarchal institution" of slavery. If the "religious feeling" should once open the way for the claims of the oppressed to be thoroughly canvassed and fairly judged of, it would spurn the restraints which have hitherto, to so great an extent, availed to "manage" it. Hence the thousand expedients, which are in a thousand ways employed to prevent free discussion.

Let those who are curious to know by what sort of management, theological professors and titled ecclesiastics may exert themselves to prevent the "religious feeling" from gushing forth in favor of the enslaved, study the "resolutions"* lately taken by the Associations of Connecticut and Massachusetts. They will see what shifts the keepers of their neighbors' consciences can resort to, to prevent light from streaming in upon the human mind through other than the regular and appointed "windows." We advise these men to examine well the foundation of their authority, before they presume too much upon the readiness of the church to wear the yoke, which they are trying to fasten on her neck. The airs they put on in disposing of evangelists and lecturers, remind us of the condescension with which his Majesty, King George, received an Indian Prince. He *kindly* held out his hand for the copper-colored foreigner to kiss. But the monarch of the forest promptly declined the honor, with the characteristic exclamation, "*Humph, I king too!*" How much the *peace* of Zion will be promoted by constraining evangelists, and lecturers, and agents—aye, all christian people to assert and exercise their rights, is a question, which we leave with our peace-loving resolution

* "Resolved, that the operations of itinerant agents and lecturers, attempting to enlighten the churches in respect to particular points of Christian doctrine and Christian morals, and to control the religious sentiment of the community on topics which fall most appropriately within the sphere of pastoral instruction and pastoral discretion as to time and manner, *without the advice and consent of the pastors and regular ecclesiastical bodies*, are an unauthorized interference with the rights, duties and discretion of the stated ministry—dangerous to the influence of the pastoral office, and fatal to the peace and good order of the churches."

makers. But we take the liberty to express our full conviction, that in their efforts to reach the slave, the friends of human nature will hold "the even tenor of their way," despite of the obstacles which may thus be thrown before them.

We beg leave to assure such as "are not quite" certain "that Dr. Rice's views of slavery and its remedy," are not both "just and important," that the abolitionists are prepared highly to appreciate the "religious feeling." Under its impulse, they have been constrained to take their position by the side of the slave; to give him their sympathy and assistance. The "religious feeling" taught them to regard him "as a man and a brother;" to identify their interests with his; and with their eye lifted up to their common Father, calmly to expect to participate in whatever of weal or of woe might fall to his lot. Had they looked upon him with the eyes of economists or politicians merely, they might not perhaps have been wholly "unmanageable." Their views might have been modified, and their movements controlled by the state of the market, or the demands of an election. They might thus have been bribed, as thousands, aye, millions have been bribed, to leave him in the hands of thieves and assassins, with the atheistic* inquiry upon their lips, *what good will it do for us to attempt any thing for his relief?* But while they recognize in him one of God's own children—dear to that heart which bled for the world's redemption, the "religious feeling" will not permit them to look on unmoved, and see wretches, by an authority more absolute than God himself ever claimed, forcing him to herd and wallow with the swine. No "management," however cunning, can put a stop to their exertions for his deliverance. When it can be shown, that reason, conscience, humanity, the Bible, are against them, then, and not till then, they will abandon their bleeding brother. Till then, they may be expected to do their utmost to bring the "religious feeling" of the nation to subserve the cause of holy freedom.

But "benevolent societies have no means," we are reminded by Dr. Rice "of accomplishing their measures, but the producing, by means of speeches and addresses, a strong excitement." In other words, instead of wielding the law-

* Job xxi. 15. What is the Almighty that we should serve Him; and what profit should we have, if we pray unto Him.

making, and war-waging power, they must be content to compass the ends they aim at, by *moral suasion*. With this, they may well be content. More than this, they need not demand. Give the friends of truth and freedom access to the understandings, consciences, and hearts of their fellow citizens; let them state facts, urge arguments, make appeals in the presence of the nation, and the dungeons of oppression will speedily crumble with the dust. Of this the abettors of slavery are well aware. Hence their desperate efforts to chain thought, to cripple inquiry, gag discussion. Do not those, who are almost if not "quite" ready to subscribe to the views of Dr. Rice know, that in a republic like ours, law-makers and their laws are indebted for their life and power altogether to public sentiment? Let this be corrupt, and wickedness in every form may be legally enacted. Purify this, and good laws shine upon the pages of the statute-book. And purified it may be under God "by an excitement produced by speeches and addresses"—by the power of moral suasion. And who will forbid Reason to expose, rebuke, and restrain the wayward Will? But the excitement! Let it come! Let the infectious pool, stagnant, green, alive with abominable reptiles, be agitated. Who would not invoke and welcome the storm? Better inhale the breath of the tempest than the infection of the plague. We do not choose to withdraw our sympathies from a celebrated "producer of excitement by means of speeches and addresses" with whom we desire to unite in objects, methods, spirit and hopes—that great master of moral suasion, who once exclaimed; "For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds; casting down imaginations and every high thing, that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." Will the Christian Spectator inform us, whether in achieving such victories, the Apostle welcomed as an auxiliary "the religious feeling," and whether he ever tried, even at the hazard of an excitement, to enlist it by "speeches and addresses?"

Dr. Rice believed, "that it never fared well with either church or state, when the CHURCH MEDDLED WITH TEMPORAL AFFAIRS!" With temporal affairs! And from what

by such an intimation, would the doctor dissuade his brethren? From meddling with one of the greatest evils; according to his own showing, a MORAL EVIL, with which our country is cursed! Slavery, that mother of abominations—that source of crimes of all sorts and sizes—that sin, second in the eyes of Dr. Rice himself only to the sin of intemperance, he would have the church leave unexposed, untouched. They must not form benevolent societies; must not make speeches and addresses; must not produce an excitement; must not enlist the religious feeling in “delivering the poor and needy—in ridding them out of the hand of the wicked! No? Why? Because it has never fared well either with church or state, when the church have meddled with TEMPORAL AFFAIRS!” Stealing babes from their mother’s bosom;—merely a temporal affair! Selling children by the pound;—merely a temporal affair! Tearing the helpless husband from his frantic wife;—merely a temporal affair! Cutting men with whips for trying to “search the Scriptures;”—merely a temporal affair! One church member putting up another at public auction;—merely a temporal affair! Full indulgence for fornication, adultery, and murder—ay, murder “by moderate correction;”—merely a temporal affair! A legalized system of oppression, which consigns millions of God’s children to insufferable wrongs and unutterable misery in this world, and to agony and despair in the future;—merely a temporal affair! Too vulgar for the church to waste her thoughts upon! or defile her hands with! We wonder, what a theological professor would have considered a *spiritual* affair?—Ah, we have it! The doctor himself has solved the problem. Such temporal affairs are not to be meddled with, “while we go on MINDING OUR OWN BUSINESS, and endeavouring to make as MANY GOOD CHRISTIANS AS POSSIBLE among masters and servants!” Here is business as spiritual as mist and moonshine. “Go on, making good Christian baby-stealers! Good Christian children-sellers! Good Christian wedlock-breakers! Good Christian Bible-withholders! Good Christians; the pledged protectors of a system of fornication, adultery, and murder! How *spiritually* minded, churches and ministers thus employed must be! With what pious disgust must they not stand aloof from such “temporal affairs,” as “defending the

poor and fatherless ;—as doing justice to the afflicted and needy !”—Such “good Christians” belong to a stock which may boast of high antiquity. The Hebrew Prophets found them very numerous ; and took the liberty on various occasions to delineate their character and dispose of their pretensions. Isaiah, though his views and feelings ill accord with those of Dr. Rice, shall place these “good Christians” in the light in which they ought to be regarded. “Yet they seek me daily, and delight to know my ways, as a nation, that did righteousness, and forsook not the ordinances of their God : they ask of me the ordinances of justice ; they take delight in approaching to God. Wherefore have we fasted, say they, and thou seest not ? Wherefore have we afflicted our soul, and thou takest no knowledge ? Behold, in the day of your fast, ye find pleasure and exact all your labors. Behold ye fast for strife, and debate and to smite with the fist of wickedness : ye shall not fast as you do this day, to make your voice to be heard on high. Is it such a fast, that I have chosen ? A day for a man to afflict his soul ? Is it to bow down his head as a bulrush, and to spread sackcloth and ashes under him ? Wilt thou call this a fast, and an acceptable day to the Lord ? Is not this the fast that I have chosen ? To loose the bands of wickedness and undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke ?” Would Isaiah have been taught to deliver himself in such terms, if he had been trained up in Dr. Rice’s Seminary ? By all his regard “for calculated consequences,” would he not have been urged to let such “temporal affairs” alone, “while he went on minding his own business, and making as many good Christians as possible !”

His skill in “calculating consequences” gave, we suppose, to Dr. Rice the right “to meddle” with slavery. For meddle with it he did, if we may believe what he asserts, that “it was *his most ardent prayer*, that we might be delivered from” this next to “the greatest evil in our country.” But though it be a “delicate subject,” we cannot well suppress the inquiry, With what sort of prayers did Dr. R. seek deliverance from the evil, of which he so loudly complains ? That they were “ardent”—“*most ardent*,” he himself has acknowledged. But what with a soul on flame with the vehemency of his desires, could he say ? Between his

views of the evil and remedy of slavery, and his prayers for "deliverance from it," we have a right to presume there must have been a strict consistency and a manifest harmony. From his description of the former, we may fairly infer the tenor of the latter. See the suppliant, then, upon his knees! Listen to his "most ardent" supplications. 'Our Father, who art in heaven. Behold this nation, under the pressure of one of the greatest evils. Next to intemperance, I deplore before Thee the evil of slavery. I lift up my soul in earnest entreaty for deliverance from it. Save, Lord, *save*, I beseech thee! I confess before thee, that this evil depends upon "the state of the *public will*;" that our "only possible chance of deliverance is by making *the people willing* to get rid of it." But how, O Lord, shall they be made willing? Thou knowest how fearful a thing it must be to have "the religious feeling brought to bear directly on the subject of slavery;" how little can be accomplished "by the combination of benevolent societies." Thou knowest how "little the great body of persons composing such *societies, are accustomed* TO CALCULATE CONSEQUENCES;" how directly they are apt to go at their measure," and to "produce a strong excitement by speeches and addresses." Lord, as I am "strenuously opposed to ANY movement by the church or ministers of religion on this subject," so do thou graciously prevent them from "TOUCHING it." Thou knowest, heavenly Father, that "slaves," thine own children though they be, "are held by law as property." Thy people cannot "*touch* the subject without touching what are called the rights of property." "We cannot move a step in this way without wakening up the strongest opposition and producing the most violent excitement." "*The whole mass of the community will be set in motion, and* THE GREAT BODY OF THE CHURCH WILL BE CARRIED ALONG!" And then, what wilt Thou do for Thy great name? Stretch out Thy arm to prevent such dreadful results. For Thou knowest it has "never fared well either with church or state, when the church has meddled with TEMPORAL AFFAIRS!" "I most devoutly wish success to the Colonization Society." Crown the efforts of this association with Thy blessing. But O, grant my "earnest wish, *that its friends may not refer to it as a means of DELIVERANCE FROM SLAVERY!*" Grant, then, Father of men, that "WE may go on *minding our own business.*"

May we leave "the subject of slavery"—the slavery of *our* brethren and *Thy* children, "with the *POLITICAL papers*, reviews," &c., "to be discussed as a *question of POLITICAL ECONOMY* !" Teach us to "treat it as a matter of *state* concernment !" Help us, Thou who hast given Thy Son to die for the enslaved ; O, help us "to examine its effects on the agriculture, commerce and manufactures of the state !" Enable us to compare the expense of free and slave labor ! In thy great mercy—for nothing is too hard for Thee—"set the people to calculating the weight of their burdens !" "Let them see how many old slaves and young slaves, who *PRODUCE NOTHING, they have to support* !" "Show them how slavery detracts from the *military* force as well as the wealth of a country, &c. &c. !" Open their eyes to "considerations of *this sort*, that, combined with the benevolent feelings growing out of a gradual, uninterrupted progress of religion, they may "set the people of their own accord to seek deliverance." "Such is my" prayer !

Such a prayer is suited to the preaching, with which Dr. R. would edify us. What a prayer, to be offered for the repentance of those, whose "*will*" has involved the nation in an evil inferior, even in the doctor's eyes, only to intemperance !—the repentance of the guilty authors and supporters of a system of oppression, which is crushing and destroying millions of God's children ! What a prayer, to be offered for the deliverance and relief of *stolen men*, who are robbed of all their rights, and whose welfare here, and whose happiness hereafter are set at nought, as a vile and worthless thing !

While he sees such men as Dr. Rice upon their knees, let every abolitionist be excited to prayer. Let him carry the insulted, outraged children of the Lord to their gracious Father. Let him carry the "little ones" of Christ, whose ransomed souls are put up at public auction, to their merciful Redeemer. Let him invoke the grace of the Holy Spirit upon His despised outcasts, who, while they are entitled to His influences, are shut away from his presence. Let him give the Avenger of the oppressed no rest, day nor night, till He arise to redress the wrongs and vindicate the rights of His own suffering poor.

Dr. Rice had reason to expect, that the "good christians" of the South would, whenever an occasion for so doing

should arise, verify his prediction respecting their readiness to conform to the world. "The whole mass of the community" he assures us, "will," if "the minister or the church touch the subject of slavery," "be set in motion, AND THE GREAT BODY OF THE CHURCH WILL BE CARRIED ALONG!" He had seen "the whole mass of the community" rushing to the slave market, *and the great body of the church CARRIED ALONG!* "The whole mass of the community" he had seen eagerly engaged in trafficking in the bodies and souls of men, *"and the great body of the church CARRIED ALONG!"* "The whole mass of the community" he had seen "set in motion" to organize and perfect a system of theft, adultery and murder, *"and the great body of the church CARRIED ALONG!"* And we have seen "the whole mass of the community set in motion," to vindicate and support this system of abominations by the authority of Reason and the Bible, *and the great body of the church CARRIED ALONG!* We have seen "the whole mass of the community" agitated with murderous violence—"breathing out threatenings and slaughter" against the open advocates of the dumb—the pledged friends of the helpless; *"and the great body of the church CARRIED ALONG!"* Yes, "CARRIED ALONG!" "CARRIED ALONG" like dead fish in a filthy stream! Verily, our doctor understood the character of the "good christians," whom he was so anxious to have his brethren endeavor to "*go on*" to multiply. But when they are "made," what are they good for? To purify a corrupt popular sentiment? No; but to be "*carried along*" with it! "Good" to rebuke prevalent iniquity? No; but to be "*carried along*" by it! "Good," to rid the poor and the needy out of the hand of the wicked? No; but to be "*carried along*" with their oppressors! "Good," to turn the feet of the wanderer into the narrow way? No; but to be "*carried along*" with the multitude in the broad road! Verily Dr. Rice could not have chosen language more happily descriptive of "the great body" of his "good christians." It ought to be written on their foreheads as it is inscribed upon their character, "CARRIED ALONG!" And yet these "good christians, carried along" as they are, are urged upon us in the great work of abolishing slavery, as teachers and guides! They are to be our exemplars and champions! They are to be placed at the head of the "Sacramental host," in their warfare with

the fiends, which, all armed, have sprung from the bowels of slavery! What must be the fate of an army marshalled under such leaders? They must of course be "*CARRIED ALONG*"! If the friends of human nature put themselves under such guides, they will richly deserve the defeat, disgrace, and destruction, to which they will inevitably be "*carried along*"! Let them be warned by the prophetic voice of Dr. Rice! Let them be instructed by what they themselves have witnessed. They have been urged again and again, and from every quarter have they been vehemently urged, to leave the slave in the hands of his oppressors, without uttering a word in his behalf. The tender mercies of the South will best provide for his welfare. Why should the Northern abolitionist interfere? Are there no churches in the land of slaves? No ministers of the gospel? Are they not best qualified to plead with felicity and effect the cause of the enslaved? At least confide in them for such ways and methods as may be best adapted to work deliverance for the oppressed. Why should not Northern philanthropists be content to act merely as auxiliaries to the "good christians" of the South? Auxiliaries in what? In "going on minding their own business"! Auxiliaries in "not touching the matter"! Auxiliaries in giving up "the subject to political papers, reviews, &c. to be discussed as a question of political economy!" Auxiliaries in being "*carried along*" with "the whole mass of the community," set in motion by the apprehension that "a step" may be taken towards "touching what are called the rights of property" in the bodies and souls of the poor! Let abolitionists beware! If they would not see their dearest hopes blasted; the slave dying in despair, or breaking his fetters with the hand of violence, let them not commit themselves, as auxiliaries with those, who are "*carried along*" down-stream with "the whole mass of the community."

To Dr. Rice's plan for the abolition of American slavery, we have strong objections.

1. *It is founded on what we cannot but regard as a gross and monstrous falsehood. A crime of appalling magnitude—a sin of crimson dye is to be "treated," merely "as a matter of state-concernment"! It is to be disposed of "as a question of political economy"! But this would be to deal falsely with transgressors. All sin involves injury.*

It occasions waste and inflicts injury. It blasts and ravages and ruins. What then? Is it to be regarded as "a question of political economy"? So to regard it is obviously to practice falsehood. And as "no lie is of the truth," so no lie can promote the cause of righteousness. Painful as the task may be, we shall continue to "rebuke" our brethren, while they "go on minding" the "business" of man-stealing; and leave it to those, who "are accustomed to calculate consequences" to reckon up the dollars and cents, which rebellion against God and treason against man may happen to cost!

2. *Dr. Rice overlooks the strongest props which support the system of American oppression.*—What if he could convince the petty tyrants around him, that slaveholding was unprofitable? Would they for that give up their vassals? What; and subdue their idleness? And yield their power? And crucify their lusts? What; and break the cord of caste? And work with their own hands? And form habits of sobriety and industry, and chastity? Such power in the interest-table? Has talk about dollars and cents such resistless energy? Go, give lessons on political economy to a bloated aristocracy. How soon they will surrender their gilded coaches, their beds of ease, their sumptuous fare! Go, tell the debauchee, that he is violating the rules of political economy. With what disgust and horror will he not forsake the slough, in which he had been wallowing! Go, tell the aspiring demagogue, that his ambition must, on the principles of political economy, be an expensive article. How soon will he turn his eye away from the giddy eminence which he is straining every nerve to reach! Political economy contending with slavery! Stubble against fire! Slaveholders know, as well as any political economist can tell them, that their pride and lusts and cruelty are unprofitable. Of this, they have demonstration in the blasted things—the mouldering ruins, which slavery has scattered all around them. But Leviathan is not so tamed. Political economy never yet brought one sinner to repentance. No, no. We shall continue under God to wield His truth, and invoke His Spirit, in contending with the foe, which we have dared to grapple with. Thus, and only thus can he be laid prostrate in the dust.

3. The results which have already followed Dr. Rice's

plan at the South, where, for ages, it has been acted on, do it great discredit. How cautiously all along have not ministers and churches abstained from touching the subject of slavery! How steadily have they "gone on minding their own business," leaving their "crushed brethren, unaided in the hands of the oppressor! How magnanimously and cautiously have they committed the whole matter "to political papers and reviews," to be discussed as a "question of political economy"! And so, master and slave, generation after generation, passed away, infected with guilt and involved in darkness, to their final account, till Dr. Rice opened a prophet's eye upon the future. And what said the seer? "The jealousy among our countrymen on this subject is such, that we cannot move a step in this way (the way of touching slavery) without wakening up the strongest opposition and producing the most violent excitement. *The whole mass of the community will be set in motion, and the great body of the church will be carried along!*" So much for the success of the doctor's plan, when he stood upon the watch-tower! And what have we been called since to witness? Throughout the whole South—the entire length and breadth of the land of leprosy—Sophistry wagging its tongue, and Violence swinging its fist, in defence of perpetual slavery! Nay, the spirit of oppression has summoned the energies of the nation, to protect his magazine of whips and chains, and engines of murder! The priest has laboured hard to prove from the Bible, that the groans, and tears, and blood of "the poor innocents" are an acceptable sacrifice to God! And the statesman has exerted himself to show, that our republican edifice is constructed of bones, broken by the rod of tyranny! And a thousand voices have been heard shouting the praises of servitude! And a thousand hands have been stretched out, eager to extend the chain, which is fastened on the slave of the South to the free laborer of the North! And what has thus "set the whole mass of the community in motion," while "the great body of the church" has been "*carried along*"? Why some of our fellow-citizens have had the audacity to examine the principles, on which our free institutions are professedly founded. In the light of these principles they have seen, that slavery under all its aspects and in all its bearings was wicked, abominably wicked, and that

it was speedily and certainly, working the ruin of the republic. What they have seen they have dared to proclaim. "Sighing over the abominations," which are multiplied around them, they have called upon their fellow-citizens to act upon the noble principles, on which our government claims to be based. For thus "touching the subject of slavery," they have exposed themselves to the fierce denunciations and malignant violence of "the whole mass" of legalized manstealers, not excepting the "good christians," who have been "*carried along*"! We think, therefore, that Dr. Rice's plan has worked badly. The evil he was so anxious to escape, has grown worse and worse. Had the friends of humanity "gone on" a little longer "minding their own business," the ruin of the republic would have been inevitable and complete.

4. Just such results as have now been described, every sound philosopher must have confidently expected. Even in the nursery, I hear him say, it is well understood, that pride and selfishness and passion always gather strength from indulgence. The more they are humored, the more eager, imperious, and violent they become. They must be exposed, resisted, subdued, or they will transform the human spirit, which they possess, into a malignant and miserable fiend. And what is true of the nursery, is true in such matters of every department of human life. No wonder, then, that the pride, and selfishness, and passions of American slaveholders have attained such a growth—have become so imperious and violent, as to throw off all restraints, and threaten the subversion of the republic. Those, who were under obligations as sacred as the throne of Heaven, to expose, and rebuke the "evils" which prevailed around them, have all along to a fearful extent, and in accordance with the advice of Dr. Rice, been "going on minding their own business"—"calculating consequences"—"treating" *sin* "as a matter of state concernment"—"giving up the subject to political papers and reviews, to be discussed as a question of political economy"! No wonder, "the whole mass of the community" have been "set in motion" to strengthen and rivet the chain of servitude, while "the great body of the church" has been "*carried along*."

On what grounds any "christian spectator" can regard the views of Dr. Rice as "both just and important," we "are

quite sure" we cannot tell. "Most fully convinced" we are, that the hearty friends of human nature can never adopt them. They are false in theory and ruinous in practice. Such views, too generally embraced, have already well nigh reduced the American churches to apostacy. Their prevalence has opened a broad way to the "slippery steep," on the verge of which the giddy republic now totters! They are at war with sound philosophy and true religion;—with every principle and arrangement of the divine government. Why then should not those, who amidst reproach and blasphemy, and violence, have dared "to consider the poor" go on plainly and boldly to expose the guilt and folly of oppression. Why should they not "treat it" as a *SIN*—a *mother-sin*, pregnant with abominations? Why should they not, as with trumpet-tongue, warn their country of her danger, and call her to repentance? God, the long-suffering, and the gracious, may crown their labors with a blessing as rich, as it must be undeserved. "Let us not be weary in well-doing; for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not."

THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM IN OUR COUNTRY.

BY DR. CHARLES FOLLEN.

THE following remarks are intended to set forth in its various bearings, and consequences, *one principle*, which seems to me of the last importance to the success of the cause of Freedom in this country. Little as I can expect to do justice to the subject, I feel assured that in itself it is entitled to the attention and earnest inquiry of every one who looks upon the history and condition of his country, not with the eye of patriotic vanity, or party prejudice, but with the clear-sighted and enlarged interest of one whose patriotism is nothing else than philanthropy at home; whose ~~judgment is not misled~~ either by assumed names under which, as under a convenient temporary incognito, parties and sects know how to promote their real designs; nor by occasional diversions which local interests and personal attachments sometimes produce in the great operations of antagonist powers.

Under all the delusive appearances on the surface of society, the insignificant bustle, and the deceptive calm ; in all the fluctuations of public opinion, the practiced eye of the unprejudiced observer will discern the incessant action and reaction, the steady current and the opposing tide, of two hostile principles which never make peace with each other but for the purpose of breaking it as soon as it has served them to gather strength for renewing their war of extermination. The internal history of every nation, every republic in particular, consists in the workings, the successful or unsuccessful conflicts, of the principles of Liberty, and of Oppression. I mean by Liberty, the possession of all the inalienable equal rights which belong to each human being as a necessary moral attribute of human nature—the right of each individual to use all his faculties of mind and body in any way not inconsistent with the equal freedom of his fellowmen ; the right to share as far as possible equally, in all the means of improvement and enjoyment which this life affords ; the right to form such social relations, domestic, civil, and religious, as may best secure the progressive happiness of mankind. And I mean by Oppression, any infringement, any undeserved and unnecessary abridgement, of those natural rights ; whether it be imposed on a portion of men, or a single individual, either by the cunning of the few, or the violence of the many.

The political existence of our country is grounded on the Declaration of the natural, inalienable rights of man. Yet the worm of Oppression is gnawing every fibre of the frame, and the death-watch is heard in every part of our social edifice. The powers, pursuits, and attainments, by which some individuals naturally acquire an ascendancy over others, and which may be perverted into instruments of oppression, are in themselves right, and intended by their Author for the mutual aid and improvement of men. The acquisition of property ; the comforts, and refinements of life ; personal bravery, talent, learning, and skill ; honor and office ; and similar causes and means of personal advancement, are fitted to promote the equality of rights and the improvement of all, if they be made the executors of the great commandment, 'He that is greatest among you shall be your servant.' This declaration of the Son of man, who came not to be ministered unto but to minister, bids

us use our property and means of comfort, to raise those who without their guilt are deprived of these things, above the degrading dependence on the favor of their more prosperous fellowmen—our own favor as well as that of others. It bids us employ our knowledge and refinement, to instruct and civilize others ; our bravery and honor, to defend the innocent against violence and contempt ; our public offices, to execute justice ; our liberty, to free the oppressed and raise them to equality with ourselves ; our religion, to rouse mankind from the slumbers of superstition, the torpor of atheism, and the death of sin, by leading them to the eternal source of truth and love, and teaching them to recognize and reverence in each human being, the image of the living God. The natural inequality in the capacity and circumstances of men, the fact that generally each individual is distinguished by the possession of something of which others are destitute, is adapted to give every one a chance of receiving, and imparting, according to his wants and superfluity, and thus by free and fair exchange, to equalize and raise the condition of all.

It is evident that the *service* which christianity enjoins as being due from man to man, is in truth the highest power, the widest influence that can be exercised by human beings. To serve a human being, a rational and moral agent, is to enable him to act out his own nature ; it is to aid him in the free and harmonious exercise of all his faculties. And who is it that exerts the widest influence, the highest powers among men ? The despot who impoverishes, corrupts and enslaves millions of his fellow men ; or the philanthropist, the servant of mankind, who liberates, and exalts them ?

Our country is possessed of all the elements of physical, political, moral, and intellectual greatness—possessions which selfishness may convert into instruments of oppression ; or philanthropy into republican blessings. Our political existence is based on the acknowledgment of the equality of human rights as the only just foundation of political governments. Can it be said of us, are we ourselves conscious, that we have really comprehended and embraced the great standard principle of republican association, to wit, that *God has made all things for all men ; and those who have, are debtors to those who have not ?* What is the result of our republican experience ?

The result lies open before the world. The great experiment that was to determine the fitness of man for self-government, has been successful, wholly successful so far as it has actually been tried. Legislation and administration, every branch of industry, science, literature, and art, education, and religion, all have grown and flourished in our land wheresoever they have been committed, in good faith, to the virgin soil of freedom. Truly the planters of this fair garden of humanity sowed good seed ; but the enemy sowed tares amidst the wheat. In the Declaration of our Independence we acknowledged the Good Principle as the only legitimate sovereign of this new world ; but in the Constitution, or at least by *the received interpretation* of it, we admitted the Evil Principle to a divided sway. *There* the inalienable rights of man were recognized as the only just foundation, and the infallible test of the validity of every law and the legitimacy of every government ; *here* the successful vindicators of political justice pledged the sword of the law for the support of an aristocracy of absolute monarchs.

Slavery is not a local evil, that strikes only the spot on which it settles, with barrenness ; it is a stagnant pool that infects the whole neighborhood, and aggravates every minor disorder in the body politic. I might set forth the advantages which this criminal inconsistency of our republic holds out to foreign invasion, and domestic conspiracy ; I might adduce the provision by which the non-slaveholding citizens of this country, in case the standing army seem insufficient for the purpose, are obliged to take up arms in defence of the oppressors of their fellow men.— I might dwell on the fact that the political history of this country does not exhibit a difference of opinion or interest between the North and the South, though in itself wholly unconnected with slavery, which has not been exasperated and inflamed by this constant, this only fearful enemy of our Union. A still more fruitful subject for consideration would be the *moral* effect of slavery not only on the slaveholders, but on the whole people whose united power is pledged to enforce a system that justifies theft, adultery, and murder of every one who dares to resist the arbitrary violence of the legitimate oppressor. Can there be any thing more demoralizing than a system of go-

vernment which countenances the principle that the morality of an action depends on the color of the skin, or on the arbitrary behest of the law-maker? While citizens can keep black slaves to serve them at the South, is it to be wondered at, that they find white slaves to vindicate them at the North? nay, that ministers of religion should represent this masterpiece of human depravity, as the ordination of a just and benevolent Providence?

But it is not my object, at present, to exhibit Slavery in all its political and moral effects.—I wish to direct public attention to the fact that the *tendency to oppression*, of which slavery is only the grossest manifestation, is apparent in our manners and habits as well as in our laws; and that when we see the anti-republicans in every walk of life and line of business endeavoring to strengthen their natural connexion by actual alliance and co-operation, it is high time that the republicans of every description, the friends of universal freedom in speaking, printing, trading, manufacturing, voting, and worshipping, should recognize each other as fellow laborers, and learn consistency from their common enemy.

Illiberal principles, anti-republican tendencies, more or less powerful and refined, are increasing in our land, and endeavoring to modify our institutions, and modes of life, and to influence public opinion. The first fruits of Slavery—and truly the grain of iniquity has borne an hundred and a thousand fold—is the absurd and cruel prejudice against color, which excludes thousands from the best institutions for education; from the enlightening, refining, and elevating influences of society; from honorable and profitable employments; from the exercise of political privileges which are grounded on the natural rights of man.

Next to the African race, the Indian occupies the highest place among the victims of oppression. How dearly has the high-minded child of the forest paid for his incautious hospitality, his fatal credulity! Unnumbered instances have shown the Indian susceptible of civilization and true religion; but the Christian, the republican white man had other interests at heart than humanity and salvation; and to promote those interests, education and the Bible were found less efficacious than broken treaties, gun-powder and rum.

Besides these prominent defects and deformities in the

conformation of our social system, we find symptoms of the same anti-republican spirit pervading every relation of private and public life. They are in part superannuated remnants of European feudal institutions ; and in part they are indications of newgrown propensities to return to the same creations of political idolatry. Imprisonment of the honest debtor for insolvency, a remnant of feudal barbarism, is still supported by the laws of many of our States ; although it has been abolished, for centuries, on the continent of Europe by the introduction of the Civil Law.—Children can be bound out as apprentices, and thus placed in a much longer and severer relation to their masters than the laws of the civilized continent of Europe will allow.—Women, though fully possessed of that rational and moral nature which is the foundation of all rights, enjoy amongst us fewer legal rights than under the civil law of continental Europe. Chivalrous courtesy is a poor substitute for rights withheld. The deference so generally paid to women, often bears the character of condescending flattery rather than respect grounded on a sincere recognition of equality.

A taste and passion for aristocratic distinction is fostered and strengthened, in early life, by parents teaching their children to look upon those things which belong equally to all men, as low and vulgar ; and to associate the idea of poverty with disgrace and vice until these words become almost synonymous ; and the hearts of the young, these overflowing fountains of tenderness toward the unfortunate, and of indignation towards injustice, are checked in their natural course, and confined to people of their own color, and their own caste. The same unkind and dangerous sentiments are often the result of school and college education. Our highest seminaries of learning are made so expensive as to become accessible only to the children of the rich, or to those of the poor who are brought there by patronage. Patronage though often the offspring of generosity, is but too apt to create in the favored individual a servile spirit, which with the possession of superior knowledge and influential connexions, may make him the most dangerous enemy of the mass of men from which he arose. If to this constitutional defect of a literary institution, there be added an artificial system of ambition and

emulation among the students, and an arbitrary government—it needs no prophet's eye to discern what fruits a republic will reap from such nurseries.

These and other seeds of an inordinate love of distinction are sufficient to account not only for the obsequious regard for titles of nobility, by which we are apt to render ourselves ridiculous in the eyes of foreigners ; but also for that intemperate craving after office, which is so often gratified at the expense of conscience and the loss of self respect. Closely allied with the love of distinction, and still more extensive in our country, is the eager pursuit of wealth. We strive after wealth in most cases not for any philanthropic object, not even for the comforts and luxuries which it may procure to the possessor, so much as for establishing and keeping up a style of living equally and if possible more magnificent than that of persons possessing the same amount of property. Our whole mode of life, dress, dwelling, furniture, domestics, &c., the society in which we move, the party to which we belong, the church and the pew in which we worship, all must be conformed to that factitious standard of *respectability* by which the “better sort of people” are distinguished from the vulgar. Thus we set at nought the great republican doctrine, that whoever faithfully discharges the duties of his office or occupation, is respectable, and *equally* respectable whether he be a clergyman or a layman, a merchant or a shopkeeper, a lawyer, a farmer, or a day laborer.—The same spirit which in the world of fashion upholds the hierarchy of classes, circles and clans, and keeps down individual opinion, feeling, and taste, is at work in the religious, and the political world. It is not confined to particular individuals, or parties ; the friends of freedom in one sphere of action often act the part of oppressors in another. Now it is manifested by attempts at preventing persons who are engaged in the same trade or profession from associating for the purpose of raising the price of their labor ; then again it is exercised by associations trying to force individuals to a compliance with their resolutions. Efforts are made to restrict the freedom of trade ; and to impair individual industry, and lessen individual liability, by privileged corporations. Some men are endeavoring to make property instead of men the basis of political representation and

to prevent universal suffrage ; while among the opposers of these anti-republican tendencies, we find some who throw obstacles in the way of universal education, which by equalizing the opportunities of knowledge lays the foundation of the most perfect equality of power. Here, from a tender solicitude for the salvation of his soul, a man is injured in his credit and business, in consequence of his conscientious adherence to an unpopular creed. There, the legislatures of free States are called upon to sanction a violation of the Constitution, and of the natural rights of man, by abridging the liberty of speech and of the press. And to complete these partial manifestations of the spirit of oppression, mobs are excited which usurp the sovereignty of the people, and in defiance of the laws and the Constitution, trample on the sacred rights of individuals and societies.

In sight of so many evils undermining the foundations of our liberty, and obstructing its progress, is the love of our country strong enough to prevent our hope and our faith from giving way to fear and despondency ? Our dangers are real, and great indeed ; but the power to resist and overcome them—the independent energy of the people—is inexhaustible ; the principles on which our republic is founded, are eternal ; the standard which its founders have set before us, is infinite.

There are redeeming influences sufficient to drive out the evil spirit, in whatever way and form it may have appeared amongst us. I have enumerated various ways in which Oppression has endeavored to gain a permanent footing in our country. But every attack of the enemy has raised up many resolute defenders. In the midst of all apparent tendencies to monarchy and aristocracy on the one hand, and to anarchy on the other, we see those who hold fast the principle, that in a republic as a collective free agent, all should govern and obey themselves ; and who for this reason on the one hand advocate *universal suffrage*, because all who are to be bound by the laws are entitled to an equal share in making them ; while on the other hand they oppose *mobs*, because those who have made the laws, are bound also to obey them. There are many still who contend that a republican government must be based upon men and not upon things ; and that industry and trade, as

well as religion and the press, are most prosperous and beneficial when neither forced nor restricted by legislative interference, but committed wholly to the operation of the great conservative and corrective principle, Live and let Live. We would fain believe also that there are men who consider money and office simply and solely as means of doing good ; and who look down with pity upon the proud elevations, and with indignation upon the walls of partition, which ambition has raised among men. For they hold that *man* is the highest of all the titles of this world ; that the blood of which God has made all nations is the source of the oldest and most genuine nobility ; and that the image which He has placed in the soul is the most glorious escutcheon. The efforts of those who would secure the highest sources of information for the benefit of those children whose parents are able to pay for superior advantages, have not prevented philanthropists from laboring to procure to all, without reference to pecuniary circumstances, the best education which the country and the present generation are able to afford. The absurdity as well as injustice of imprisoning the honest debtor has in most places called up a triumphant opposition. It begins to be thought also that the generosity which marks the conduct of men towards women will not pay off the debt of justice which the equality of our moral nature enjoins. The Indian native finds among the strangers who first came to warm themselves at his fire, and extinguished it when they had lighted their own, at least some impartial friends whose earnest pleading though it cannot protect him from the rapacity, may yet prevent his rising in witness at last against the whole race of his oppressors. And the colored man kneeling in his chains, finds among indifferent thousands one and more than one that will acknowledge him as " a man and a brother ;" yes, many a one who in spite of the Pharisee that supports slavery by the sword of the law, and the Priest that vindicates it from the Book of God, dares to be " a neighbor to him that fell among thieves."

I have endeavored to set in a clear light, side by side, the most important controversies which agitate our country ; and to trace all this complicated variety of action and re-action to the fundamental principles of Liberty and Oppression. Whoever is acquainted with the powers which

are engaged in this great warfare, must come to the conclusion that every attempt at oppression of any kind, in this country, must end in defeat if only those who contend for Freedom in the various branches of private and public life, will recognize each other as fellow-laborers in the same cause. It is not to be expected, so long as human beings remain human, that attempts at oppression, the workings of the selfish principle in man—will ever cease entirely, even under the freest form of government. The great permanent advantage of a republican over every other government, consists in the certainty that the cause of Freedom must conquer whenever the friends of Freedom act in unison. The simple reason then why in our country the cause of Freedom has been sometimes defeated, or not altogether victorious, is to be found in the fact that many of her boldest champions on one battle-field are engaged fighting in the ranks of her enemies on another.

There is no need of proving and illustrating this obvious truth.—It would be difficult indeed to believe if we had not witnessed it; if we had not seen defenders of the equal rights of citizens uniting with their antagonists in opposition to the advocates of the equal rights of men; if we had not seen avowed enemies of all monopolies and restrictions on industry and trade, siding with the supporters of slavery; and professed friends of law and order in society, among the instigators and abettors of mobs.

Those who are one in principle, should be one also in action. This great truth is urged upon the friends of freedom with peculiar force, by the superior practical sagacity of their antagonists. One look upon the state of society in this country and elsewhere is sufficient to see how those who by wealth, or talent, or office, have risen to eminence in society, combine their means of influence in most cases not for diffusing independence, knowledge, and comfort, among their less favored fellow-men, but in order to keep themselves aloof from the mass in the exclusive enjoyment of their superior advantages. And the ministers of religion, the commissioned messengers of the Son of Man who came to establish a universal brotherhood among men, instead of insisting upon the exercise of distributive and retributive justice as the first condition of brotherly love, think their mission fulfilled when they admonish the higher

classes as they are called, to charity and condescension ; and the lower classes as they are called, to contentment with their lot, and humble respect for their superiors.

But besides these results of general experience proving the existence of an elective affinity between the favored few, and the importance of a common centre of gravity among the undistinguished many, there are facts of recent occurrence which must impress the friends of freedom in this country with the necessity of union and consistency among themselves. I refer to some remarkable sentiments which the recent agitation of minds on the subject of slavery has brought out. Some of the most distinguished and influential advocates of this system have in this important crisis abandoned the principles of equal rights and democracy which they had heretofore defended with a high-minded patriotic inconsistency, and have called upon the men of property in the non-slaveholding States, upon all who like themselves live upon the labor of others, to join them in their efforts of self-defence against a common enemy. One of the speakers* in the last Congress asked, "What was meant by the declaration that all men were born free and equal ? Its meaning was that all were born to equal political privileges. This was an abstract truth, and had no political application. There was never a community where one class was not held in bondage by another class. Every nation was divided into capitalists and laborers." Another,† proceeding on the same ground of reasoning, remarked, "The sober and considerate portions of the citizens of non-slaveholding States, who have a deep stake in the existing institutions of the country, would have little forecast not to see that the assaults which are now directed against the institutions of the Southern States, may be very easily directed against those which uphold their own property and security. A very slight modification of the arguments used against the institutions which sustain the property and security of the South, would make them equally effectual against the institutions of the North, including banking, in which so large an amount of its property and capital is invested." Many other similar remarks might be

* Mr. Pickens, in his speech in the House of Representatives, Jan. 21st, 1836.

† Mr. Calhoun, in his Report in the Senate, Feb. 4th, 1836.

quoted in which slavery is represented as the corner-stone of republican freedom, and the only means by which the introduction of royalty and a hereditary nobility can be prevented in non-slaveholding states.* The amount is, that those who hold property in men, would persuade all those who hold property in things, that all attacks upon slavery are virtually assaults upon property; and that instead of trying to convert the slaves of the South into free laborers, the men of property should combine to convert all laborers into slaves.

We would trust that there is among the men of property in the non-slaveholding states too much respect for what is worth more than wealth, to make them overlook the difference between men and things, and to think themselves more closely united with slave-owners than with those who own nothing but their own souls and bodies. Still, it cannot be denied that at the North as well as at the South, slavery has been defended on the ground of its being a species of *property*. Nay more, the anti-abolition mobs which have disgraced many of our towns, and particularly our cities, have not been excited and promoted by those whose personal rights are their all, but by "men of property and standing," as they called themselves or were called by the newspapers and journals devoted to their interests. Many men of property, indeed, have disapproved of these criminal proceedings; but if the object of the mobs had been an attack upon a bank, or other depository of money, would our monied men have confined themselves to a mere expression of disapprobation?

Under such circumstances, it becomes those who have not lost all sense of the dignity of human nature, to declare that they consider the personal rights of man as the foundation of every other; and that they cannot recognize any property which is inconsistent with that which every human being holds in his own soul and body. If there ever is to be in this country a party that shall take its character and name not from particular liberal measures, or popular men, but from its uncompromising and consistent adherence to Freedom—a truly liberal, and thoroughly republican party—it must direct its first decided effort against

* Gov. M'Duffie's Message to the Legislature of South Carolina; Mr. Calhoun's Report; and the speeches of Mr. Pickens, and other advocates of Slavery.

the grossest form, the most complete manifestation of Oppression ; and having taken anti-slavery ground, it must carry out the principle of Liberty in all its consequences. It must support every measure conducive to the greatest possible individual, and social, moral, intellectual, religious, and political freedom, whether that measure be brought forward by inconsistent slaveholders, or consistent freemen. It must embrace the whole sphere of human action, watching and opposing the slightest illiberal, anti-republican tendency ; and concentrating its whole force and influence against Slavery itself, in comparison with which, every other species of tyranny is tolerable, by which every other is strengthened and justified.

SLAVERY AND THE CONSTITUTION.

BY REV. SAMUEL J. MAY.

WHEREVER the Abolitionist goes to plead the cause of our enslaved countrymen, he is met with the objection very confidently urged in bar of his proceeding, that an arrangement was made in the Constitution of this confederacy, by which the people of the non-slaveholding States are bound not to attempt in any way the overthrow of Slavery. The alleged compact, it is urged, obliged our predecessors, who were the first parties to it, and obliges us, who have succeeded to the blessings of the "glorious union" they effected on this condition, silently to acquiesce in the continuance of that accursed system of physical oppression, civil degradation and soul-murder ; nay more, to co-operate actively to enforce it, if at any time our Southern brethren may need our assistance. This objection is met with every where. It is flippantly iterated by thousands, who never read the Constitution of the United States. It has been passionately insisted on by some of the members of Congress—resounded furiously in the public meetings of citizens that have been held in every city and almost every considerable town at the South ; echoed with equal emphasis from the pro-slavery meetings at the North ; and even re-echoed from the desecrated walls of Faneuil Hall.

It has been gravely urged by the professed ministers of the everlasting Gospel of peace and righteousness; and set forth even in the annual speeches or messages of the governors of the northern not less than of the southern states. This objection has been made the pretext of all the pro-slavery mobs which have rioted the past year through the land, led on by "gentlemen of property and standing" who have gone unpunished by the ministers of justice, and half excused by the guardians of the public weal. It has been given by many as the reason why they have withheld themselves from the cause of those who are pining in our country under the most abject bondage; and has even led some, who have put their hands to the plough, to falter and look back. In one word, we may say of this objection, that it is made "the stone of stumbling and the rock in the way" of that reformation which alone can avert *ruin* from our country. Several of the advocates of our holy cause have exposed with great clearness the futility of this objection, but we have thought it deserves a still more complete refutation. This we propose to attempt in the following pages.

We owe it to the memory of those venerated men whose names are conspicuous in the early history of our Republic, and who are accused of having entered into such an iniquitous agreement, to exonerate them, if we can, from the tremendous responsibility that is laid upon them by our opposers. If this cannot be fairly done, we owe it to the cause of justice and humanity to let them be despoiled of the high reputation they have hitherto enjoyed, and go down to posterity covered with the infamy they will deserve. What heavier charge could be alleged against them? It is claimed that those very men who had roused the people of the American Colonies to a sense of their wrongs, by clear expositions of the natural and civil rights of man—who had proclaimed to an oppressed world the soul-stirring doctrines of the Declaration—had encouraged their fellow subjects to rise in the confidence of right principles, and attempt their own deliverance from colonial subjection—had stimulated them to persevere in the unequal contest by thrilling appeals to the love of liberty—had guided them by their wisdom in counsel, and animated them by their courage in the field;—it is claimed that those men who had solemnly pledged "their lives, their fortunes and

their sacred honor" "to the cause of Freedom and of Human Rights," did afterwards guaranty to the Southern States the unquestioned exercise of their assumed right to enforce the enslavement of one sixth part of the population of the land, many of whom had shared with them in all the hardships and perils of their struggle for independence. A heavier accusation of inconsistency, treachery and base ingratitude could not be sustained against the leading men of any nation in any age. We long to prove them not guilty; and shall therefore incline to such a construction of all their acts as will be consistent with the high principles they professed, and for which they dared and suffered so much. But we purpose not to force their deeds into an accordance with their words. If their conduct will not endure a fair investigation—if they were not truly upright and honorable men, lovers of liberty and friends of human rights—we shall leave them to their fate—leave them to be abhorred as hypocrites, false friends, and the worst enemies of their race. But after much consideration of the Constitution which they framed, we enter upon an exposition of it, in full confidence that we shall be able fairly to acquit them of the charge brought against them, and rescue their names from the infamy to which our opposers would consign them—an infamy which could not be too deep, if they did indeed pledge the integrity of the Union, and the good faith of the non-slaveholding states in particular, that the oppressors of our colored population should be undisturbed in their wickedness, even by the voice of remonstrance; and be sustained and protected by the physical force of the nation.

In order to judge fairly of what the framers of the Constitution actually did with respect to slavery, or to draw any correct inferences as to what they intended to do, we must know what they had it in their power to do; what the circumstances under which they were appointed to act, permitted them to do. They were not convened to form the Union of the American States, nor to propose the principles upon which that Union should be formed. That Union had already subsisted twelve years, when the delegates who formed our present Constitution were assembled. This Republic was originally composed of what were thirteen Colonies of Great Britain, independent of each other,

and more or less subject to the mother country under charter, proprietary or royal governments. The union of those colonies was a result to which they were impelled by the urgency of similar grievances, and the solicitation of obvious mutual advantages. It was a result, at which they arrived by successive approaches. Repeatedly had they been required to act in concert to repel a common danger, or to promote the general good. And as long ago as 1754, seven of them sent commissioners, who met at Albany, and unanimously resolved that a union of the colonies was absolutely necessary for their preservation, and proposed a plan of general government. In October 1768, a congress of delegates from nine colonies assembled at New-York, and digested a Bill of Rights on the subject of taxation.—In September 1774 an association of twelve colonies was formed, and delegates authorized to meet and consult for the *common welfare*. In 1775 the first congress of the thirteen colonies assembled at Philadelphia; and in July 1776, issued the Declaration of Independence. In November 1777 congress agreed upon the celebrated articles of confederation, under which the then United States successfully terminated the Revolution. This was the first formation of a general government, and it continued until the present Constitution was substituted for it in 1788.

It would be seen by a glance at the history of these successive steps, that they were taken to avert some evils threatening the colonies, or to secure some benefits to be obtained only by united effort. And from the beginning to the consummation of the union, we should observe the utmost jealousy of any unnecessary encroachment upon the power of the states. The thought of an independent general government, probably, did not enter into the public mind, until the revolutionary war had actually commenced. And to suppose that this republic took its rise in a desire of the people generally throughout the country, to establish a government, based upon the equal rights of man, would betray great ignorance of our national history. No doubt the true principles of a republic were as imperfectly appreciated, and as little relished by some of those who became members of our confederacy, as they are now, or were then, by the privileged classes under the monarchies or aristocracies of Europe. In New England where, under their charters, the people

had from the beginning exercised many of the prerogatives of republican freemen, republican principles were early imbibed, and jealously guarded. But in the colonies, which were under the proprietary and royal governments, although in some a share in the administration of civil affairs was accorded to the people, yet it was so small a share, that the republican principles were not readily disseminated among them; and to this day are very imperfectly appreciated in that part of the country where they were. Of all the colonies however, it must be acknowledged, that the protection or extension of some right or privilege, was the leading purpose of their mutual counsels and united efforts. Most of the people looked no further than to the promotion of their own immediate interests. Individuals there were, who entertained some of those generous conceptions of a righteous government, which the true christian republican of the present day delights to cherish, and labors to realize. But the people generally had not discerned the rights that are common to all men, and which cannot be alienated from any without the most grievous wrong, and daring sin. The American colonies were not in this respect, in advance of the rest of the world. Their own grievances had opened their eyes, so that they could see clearly the rights of some men, but not the rights of all. While they were complaining of the aggressions of the British government, and mustering all their strength to resist them, they were holding several hundred thousands in the abject condition of slavery. When the American Revolution began it had scarcely been intimated in all christendom, that the enslavement of the Africans was an outrage on human rights. Three or four solitary individuals in England and America, had at long intervals remonstrated against it; but the public mind was unmoved. The African slave trade was prosecuted with growing rapacity, and without any general condemnation. In 1771, one hundred and ninty two ships sailed from England to the coast of Africa provided for the importation of more than 47,000 slaves. Nor did the amount of this accursed traffic decrease much in twenty years, for Bryan Edwards, the historian of the West Indies, ascertained, that in 1793, the whole number annually exported from Africa by all the European powers, was 74,000, of which 38,000 were exported by the British merchants. Not that the labors of

Sharp, and Clarkson, and Wilberforce, were without avail. In England, every month added to the number of their converts; and in this country there were not a few who responded to their cry, and extended to them a helping hand. But whatever may have been the sentiments of individuals in America respecting the enslavement of the Africans, there was not at the commencement of the Revolution any general opinion against it even in New England. When the thirteen American colonies in 1777, united under the articles of confederation, slavery existed in all of them; and it still continued in all of them excepting three or four in 1788, when the present constitution was formed. Among the articles of confederation, by which in 1777 the American states consummated their Union, there was not one that seems to have had any reference to the slaves, in any way. In the enumeration of the powers to be entrusted to Congress, there was no clause under which that body could have abolished the African Slave Trade, or the domestic traffic in human beings—the regulation of commerce was in no wise committed to it. In short, under the old confederation, there was not an inch of ground upon which the national legislature could have stood in an attempt to relieve the enslaved population of the land, how much soever the public sentiment might have come to require it. Now we expect to shew that, under the new constitution of 1788, so far from any arrangement having been made between the several states, by which any general action on the subject of slavery is precluded, the friends of humanity, and the enemies of slavery have obtained some advantages for the prosecution of their benevolent purposes, which they had not under the old form of government. It is not enough for our opposers to say, that the Constitution did not itself abolish slavery, nor empower Congress to abolish it. It is not enough that they can point to two or three articles, in which the existence of slavery in some parts of the confederacy is indirectly recognized. If they would prove their allegation, they must shew that the Constitution itself has placed a barrier in the way of those who desire to abolish slavery, nay, that it has in fact provided for the perpetuity of this abomination in our land.

Of course we shall not be understood to mean that the framers of our Constitution did all for the relief of the co-

lored population that justice and humanity demanded. We only insist that they entered into no compact to perpetuate their bondage, or to hinder their future enfranchisement. If we were better acquainted with all that transpired on the subject, we might be satisfied that nothing more explicitly favorable could have been introduced ; and that if it had been, the majority of the states would have rejected it. But some will say the delegates from the Northern States made us partners in the iniquity by assenting to a Constitution under which slavery might subsist. Before any one adopts this decision, let him consider that the States represented in the Convention were already united under a general government—that slavery was already established in them—and that the rejection of the new constitution would not have abolished slavery, nor have dissolved the partnership of the North in the iniquity of the South. It would have left the States still united under the old confederation, which was devised in the emergency of the Revolution, and found to be a very feeble bond, and an inefficient form of government ; and, as we expect to show, was far less auspicious to the colored population. We agree that the northern delegates ought to have resisted to the last such a compromise as our opposers would have the public believe was made in the Constitution. They ought to have resisted it, even if by so doing they would have thrown back the confederacy into its original elements.—But no such compromise is there.—All that can be adduced, in support of the allegation, are three circumlocutory articles,* the meaning, force and tendency of which we are now prepared to scrutinize.

Surely the Preamble to the Constitution admonishes us not to expect any provision for the continuance of a system of oppression, which the men in that Convention were too intelligent to perceive was an outrage upon the rights of man ; and were too sagacious not to foresee would destroy domestic tranquility, impair the general welfare, and ultimately dissolve the Union. If they were sincere in wishing to promote the purposes therein avowed, nothing

* The published Report of the proceedings of the Convention is lamentably meagre ; but we may gather from it, and from the result of those proceedings, as given in the Constitution, that slavery and the slave trade were topics of no little consideration and debate. We look forward with eager expectation to the report about to be published from the manuscript of the late James Madison.

could have been further from their intention than to admit any thing into the Constitution which would perpetuate slavery.

In the Article I., however, 2d Section, third clause, there is a passage which our opposers confidently insist on as being a provision made for the perpetuity of the slave system. It is as follows :

“Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several states, which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, *three-fifths of all other PERSONS.*”

Now it seems to us obvious, that this clause was not worded thus for the sake of giving any sanction or countenance to slavery—much less any guaranty of its undisturbed continuance—but merely to satisfy the demand of the southern delegates for what they considered a more equal representation of their states. A large portion of the population in those states—nearly all the laboring class—were slaves occupying the place of those who in the other states being freemen, were of course represented. It was therefore claimed by the southern members of the Convention, that some representation of that portion of their inhabitants ought to be allowed, else they would not have their due weight in the councils of the nation. With what reason this claim was urged, it is not for us now to inquire. Those who then urged it, thought they had reason enough on their side ; and were anxious no doubt to procure for the laboring population of their states even the same representation that was unhesitatingly accorded to the laboring population of the Northern States. All that we are concerned now to ascertain is, whether in the construction of the article framed so as to satisfy in part their demand, there is any thing designed or adapted to sustain slavery. We think we can discover in it something, which, on the contrary, tends to subvert the system. In *the first place*, the very careful avoidance of the word slaves, at the expense of an uneasy circumlocution, is to us an impressive evidence that the weight of sentiment and feeling in that Convention was against the system, by which the unalienable

rights of man are entirely set at nought. If they meant to do what our opposers say they did, why were they not explicit? Were those men afraid to do what they thought ought to be done? Would our opposers have it believed, that they meant to smuggle into the Constitution of their country, an article which they were ashamed to admit openly?

Secondly—by calling those to whom the clause refers, *persons*, and admitting them to be represented as such in the councils of the nation, the convention repudiated the idea of their being no more than “chattels personal,” and passed an implied condemnation upon all who hold them as such. At least, this appears to us a fairer interpretation than our opposers have put upon it, because it is more in accordance with their intentions as avowed in the preamble of the Constitution.

And *thirdly*, the refusal to admit *those persons* to an equal representation with other classes, far from expressing any approval of their degraded condition, intimated the contrary, and held out an inducement to their oppressors to raise them at least to the grade of “those bound to service for a term of years,” in order that the states where they live may be represented according to the whole number of their inhabitants, instead of a part.* At this day, if slavery should be abolished, and the two-fifths of those who are now excluded, be admitted to representation, some of our southern states would be authorized to send to Congress several members more than they now do. This is a disadvantage—under some circumstances a great disadvantage—which is imposed upon those states, by the Constitution, so long as they persist in the enslavement of their laboring population. One million of the inhabitants of the slave states are now by this article excluded from the enumera-

* The first aspect of this article is particularly offensive. It seems as if it gave to the oppressors additional power in the national legislature (in a certain proportion to the number of their victims) thereby enabling them more effectually to secure themselves in the violations of the rights of man. But we deem the aspect put upon it above, to be more just. Let it be remembered the qualifications requisite for electors are determined by the state governments. They are different in different states. In all of them thousands are enumerated and represented, who are not admitted to the election of their representatives. If injustice is done in this way to any, the blame attaches to the state, and not to the national constitution. This we have shown above offers a strong inducement to the slave states to cease from slavery.

tion, by which the number of their representatives is to be determined.

The next passage, which is quoted by our opposers to sustain their assertion that the Constitution meant to favor and protect slavery, is the 9th section of Article I., as follows :

“The migration or importation of such persons as any of the states now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight ; but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each person.”

Here, it is said, the Constitution was so framed as to encourage and protect the African Slave Trade for twenty years. This we deem an unfair representation of it. We regard it as, on the whole, a favorable result of a dispute on this point, which agitated the Convention deeply. The New England and Pennsylvania delegates and some others were anxious to procure the abolition of the slave trade.— On the other hand, the delegates from the southern states, having closed their eyes to its atrocity, and believing, as it was commonly believed in that day, that the staple commodities of the states they represented could be raised only by African slaves, were equally anxious to have that trade continued. That trade, however, had never been carried on by the authority of the general government. Under the old confederation, Congress could have no power, sooner or later, to suppress or regulate it. In the 8th Section of Article I. of the new Constitution, the powers were enumerated, with which Congress was to be entrusted.— Among these was the power “to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.” The question consequently arose in the Convention, whether under the provisions in the foregoing section, Congress was to be authorized forthwith to abolish the slave trade ? We have in the report scarcely any account of the debate. It was probably vehement. As to the result, whatever we of the present day may think of it, by its contemporaries, it was considered a *gain* to the cause of humanity ; for if on the one hand, the opposers of that accursed traffic were compelled to yield to the majority of the Convention, that Congress should not prohibit it prior to

1808, on the other hand, they gained for Congress the power to prohibit it at that time, when it was accordingly done. Strange as it may seem to us, who have learnt better by experience, it was then thought, that the abolition of the slave trade was an effectual blow at the whole system of slavery. And this article, which is now alleged as proof, that the framers of the Constitution intended to perpetuate slavery, was in that day regarded by many as evidence of a determination to subvert it.* The advocates of liberty and righteousness in the Convention, it is fair to presume, would have rejoiced could they have put a stop immediately, and forever, to the outrages that were then and now are perpetrated upon the coasts of Africa; but as they could not do so much, they thought it well to do something less—to get a *limit* assigned to the atrocious business, although it were at the interval of twenty years.† To charge upon them a

* This is obvious from the debates in the Massachusetts Convention, called in 1788, to consider and ratify the Constitution. Some of the members strenuously objected to this article (Rev. Mr. Neal and General Thompson in particular) because they contended the Constitution thereby gave its sanction to the slave trade. These gentlemen uttered sentiments honorable to their hearts, such as would entitle them to be ranked with the incendiary abolitionists of these degenerate days. On the other side gentlemen argued, that the steps taken in this article towards the abolition of slavery, was one of the beauties of the Constitution. They remarked that in the confederation there was no provision whatever for the attainment of so desirable an end, at any time; but the Constitution provided that Congress may, after twenty years, totally annihilate the slave trade, which it was then believed would be the death blow of slavery. In the interim, all the states were at liberty to prohibit it; and this article imposed a heavy duty upon those, who chose to prosecute it. Mr. Dawes remarked, in the course of the debate, “we may say, that although slavery is not smitten by an apoplexy, yet it has received a mortal wound, and will die of consumption.”

† The abolition of the slave trade by the British Parliament also in 1808, is a coincidence, which has led us to apprehend, that the otherwise unaccountable delay of that act of humanity, from year to year after the unsparing efforts of Clarkson, and the fervent eloquence of Wilberforce had prepared the public to desire and expect it, was owing to the time fixed upon in our Constitution for a similar act by the American Congress. The British statesmen, ever jealous of the commercial prosperity of other nations, and foreseeing the competition they were to meet with in the enterprise of this young republic, were afraid lest the commerce of the United States would derive some advantages from the English share of the slave trade, if they should require their merchants immediately to abandon it, and therefore they contrived, upon one pretext and another, after they saw the abolition of their trade to be inevitable, to defer the act of Parliament until the year when they had every reason to suppose a similar act would be passed by the Congress of the United States.

If this apprehension be well founded, how is the load of responsibility and guilt accumulated upon those in our country, who procured the delay of mercy!

And those “who procured the delay” were a majority of the framers of the Constitution. So we do not see how our excellent correspondent clears the Constitution of the sin of upholding the slave trade for twenty years. That some of

compromise of principle in this case, we think would be unfair. They doubtless did the best they could. They gained much for the sake of humanity, although not all they intended. Suppose a convention of the states should now be called to devise such amendments in our laws and institutions, as would promote more perfectly the general welfare. And suppose the friends of temperance, having urged the importance of the immediate suppression of the trade in ardent spirits, should, after an earnest debate, obtain the assent of the Convention to an article providing for the entire suppression of that trade, at the expiration of ten or fifteen years; and meanwhile imposing a heavy duty upon it: would it be fair to say of them, that they had compromised their principles, or of the article itself that it encouraged the prosecution of the rum trade for ten or fifteen years? We think not. Or suppose again, that there should be abolitionists in the convention, and they, having earnestly endeavored to procure the immediate recognition of the rights of our enslaved countrymen, should be able to obtain no more than the abolition of slavery after the lapse of ten or twenty years, would it be fair to charge them with having given their sanction to the continuance of this unrighteousness. Who does not see it would be unjust? These cases we think are parallel to the one we have been considering.

The next passage, to which we have been often pointed as giving further support to the objection we are considering, is Article IV. Sect. II. clause 3d. "No person held to service or labor in one state, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

We frankly confess, that it is less easy to give to this article than to any other in the Constitution, such an exposition as will reconcile it with the avowed sentiments and purposes of the framers. This difficulty has been enhanced, if not created, however, by the subsequent action of Con-

the framers did their duty we admit, but it is no justification of the majority to say that if they had not shielded the trade for twenty years, the old confederation would have done so forever. We should not have dared, with our present feelings, to vote for the first clause of the ninth section.—Ed.

gress under this article. We refer to the Act of 1793, for the recapture of fugitive slaves. There was then, no doubt, an arrangement made by the general government to assist those who have the hardihood to hold their fellow beings as property, to re-take them as such, if they flee for refuge from oppression into a free state. But for this the Congress of '93 alone are responsible—not the Convention of '88. The Act has recently been pronounced by a distinguished judge of one of the State courts, unconstitutional; and we have no doubt that it is so.* Congress could have no authority in the premises, other than that conveyed in the article before us. Now we look into this in vain to find any right which our national legislature had to enact a law regulating the re-capture of a fugitive slave from any state, more than it would have had to enact a law providing in what way persons shall be held to service in any state. The Congress of 1793, with equal propriety might have passed an act for the abolition of slavery. The members of that body transcended their powers. All that the framers of the Constitution had done, or could be persuaded to do, was so to construct the article now under our consideration, that those who are held to service in any state may be re-taken there, if they can be. But if it leaves to the several states to prescribe how persons may or shall be held to service or labor there, it equally leaves to the several states to prescribe how the claim to the fugitive shall be preferred and proved. In short, the Constitution does

* We have not seen any authentic report of Judge Hornblower's decision, but a letter of the counsel for the alleged slave addressed to the late Thomas Shipley, represents it as follows: Ed.

"First—The Chief Justice and Justice Ryerson have expressed a strong inclination, and it is evidently their opinion (although they said it was not necessary to decide it in this particular case) that *the law of Congress regulating the apprehension of fugitive slaves is unconstitutional*, because no power is given to Congress by the Constitution of the United States to legislate on this subject; and their reasoning carried conviction to every mind.

Second—They said (and in this Judge Ford also concurred) that if Congress had a right to legislate on this subject, then the act of New Jersey, being variant from the law of Congress, was null and void—the law of Congress being the paramount law of the land—and that, consequently, all proceedings under the act of the State of New Jersey, were null and void.

Third—That if the legislature of New Jersey had a right to legislate on the subject, yet that our act was void, because it deprived a citizen of New Jersey of the right of trial by jury, which was guaranteed by the constitution of N. Jersey.

Fourth—They decided that the black color was no longer presumptive evidence of slavery in this state."

leave the responsibility of holding slaves, where it was found, and expresses no intention to make the national government any way subservient to its support. If the procedure of the free states hitherto has been subservient to this end, let the blame and disgrace rest where it should.

No person, surely, who had not learnt it from some other source, would ever suspect, from the language of this clause, that such a description of human beings as slaves existed in our land. Nor is there any thing here, which could be well spared, if slavery did not exist in any part of the country. Other persons—apprentices, hired servants, &c., are held to service or labor, in all the states, and are held by different tenures under the laws of the different states, so that precisely such a provision as that in the article before us would be needed, to secure to employers the services due from the employed, who might else evade their obligations by fleeing into an adjoining state, as they may now do, if they can escape into the British provinces.

As the clause does not describe what is meant by persons held to service or labor, we are not obliged to suppose that those are meant, who are constrained by the unrighteous bonds of slavery. The Constitution nowhere makes mention of such persons; why then should we suppose they were meant, if we can avoid the supposition? It is true, as we have said, a construction has, from an early period, been put upon this article, by which it is made to require that we shall not give assistance or shelter to fugitives from slavery—shall offer no asylum to the oppressed of our own land, but help to return them into their hopeless bondage. What then? If this be not necessarily the meaning—if a construction more honorable to our fathers, and more consonant with their avowed principles and intentions can be put upon it, we surely ought to prefer it. We of the free states have long enough made ourselves partners in the sin of the slaveholders, by voluntarily acquiescing in such an interpretation of an equivocal part of the Constitution, as to countenance and uphold them in their outrages upon the rights of man. The case was once very similar in England. For nearly fifty years the opinion generally prevailed, sustained by a decision of high legal authority, “that slaves were not made free by coming to England.” This of course gave boldness to the holders of slaves. “The

British newspapers were defiled with advertisements for runaway slaves, and with notices of negroes for sale." But Granville Sharp called the opinion in question. He examined with great care the British Constitution, and laws, and after seven years toil and arduous struggle, he succeeded in convincing the highest Court, and procured from Lord Mansfield, in 1772, the memorable decision, that so soon as a slave sets his foot on the soil of Great Britain, he is free. Is there not now as much respect for the rights of man in the free states of this republic, as there was in England sixty-eight years ago? Let it be ascertained by a fair trial. The recent decision of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts is a good omen. The Constitution of the republic opposed no barrier to any improvement in this respect our legislatures may see fit to make. And certainly the slave states have no reason to expect any favors from us in regard to their colored population, seeing they have uniformly set at nought the rights conferred upon our colored population, both by the state and national Constitutions. According to the Constitution of the Union, "citizens of each state shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several states." But if citizens of Massachusetts—freemen—voters—who happen to be colored, go into one of the slave states, so far from being admitted to any privileges, they are forthwith subjected to all the disabilities and hardships of colored people there. No respect whatever is shown to them as the citizens of a sister state. They are treated with the utmost rigor—are thrown into prison, and sold into slavery. The southerners insist that they must do all this, in order to preserve their system of domestic servitude. Why should not we of the North do at least as much for the sake of freedom, as they do for slavery?—The Constitutions of the free states give no sanction to slavery. Our colored population can no more be deprived of their liberty than the white. If colored people come from the South to reside among us, why are they not at once entitled to all the privileges and immunities of colored people here? If so, they cannot be regarded by us as slaves one moment, without violating our own Constitution. Therefore, should men come and claim them as "chattels personal," let us tell them with an emphasis that will make them quake, that, among us a man may not hold his fellow

being as property, unless he can "show a title deed from the Creator." If they should come and claim them as persons held to serve or labor for them, let us demand proof of a contract made between the parties. The Constitution prescribes no *process*, by which fugitives from slavery may be re-taken from among us. Congress had no right to prescribe the law they did, in 1793, therefore it is not binding upon us. And let us see to it, in our several states, that the process by which such a fugitive may be recovered, shall be made as difficult as possible. Let us throw every impediment, every hindrance and perplexity in the way of such unrighteousness.

There is but one other passage in the Constitution which we have ever heard quoted to prove that the Constitution sanctions and upholds slavery. It is the 4th sect. of Article IV., viz :

"The United States shall guaranty to every state in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion ; and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened) *against domestic violence.*"

No particular kind of domestic violence is here specified ; and we see not therefore by what authority this expression is understood to mean the violent attempts of the slaves to emancipate themselves. Other kinds of domestic violence there may be, beside servile insurrections, requiring the interference of the United States forces. A gang of Irishmen and sailors may become so turbulent in their celebration of the 4th of July, or a mob of "gentlemen of property and standing" may grow so outrageous in their zeal against abolitionists, as to commit violence upon the dwellings and persons of their fellow citizens, and be wholly beyond the control of the constabulary force. In such an emergency the assistance of the military may be thought necessary. And this article empowers the legislature, or governor of a state to avail himself of the assistance of the United States' army, if any portion of it be stationed near at hand.* Now, if a due respect for the liberty of speech,

* A resort to such assistance might be indispensably necessary. A gentleman intimated to the Mayor of Boston during one of the pro-slavery riots there in Oct. 1835, that it would be well for him to call out the military of the city. "I should call for them in vain, he replied, for many of the members of our militia companies are now active in the mob."

and the right peaceably to assemble, should ever again prevail in the northern states, and a determination should be shown by their executives to protect those rights, by a resort to the aid proffered by the Constitution in the article now under review, would our opposers be willing to allow to us, that the framers of our general government intended to uphold abolitionism, because they had provided thus to repress the violence of its enemies? We trow not. Much less shall we allow, that they meant to give support to the slave system, because under this article the military power of the Union may be called out to prevent its *violent* overthrow. The article was undoubtedly designed to offer the protection of the Union against insurrectionary movements of every kind. The Constitution provides other means for the redress of all grievances. The state wherein such protection may be needed, alone will be responsible for the application that is made of it. But we may fairly contend that it would be more congenial with the spirit of the men, who framed our Constitution (whatever may be the spirit of our own time) to apply the force of the nation to suppress violence against liberty, than violence in its behalf.

We have now examined, with what fairness our readers must judge, every passage in the Constitution of our country, that we have ever heard quoted as intended to uphold slavery. Whatever may be thought of our comments, the articles are what they are. They speak for themselves. It is impossible not to perceive the pains which the framers of these articles took to avoid any explicit recognition of slavery. The words slave and slavery do not once occur throughout the Constitution. And every article is so framed that it would be needed, even if there were no slaves in the land. Only six words in any of these articles would be so much as redundant, were slavery to be abolished, viz. "three-fifths of all other persons," Art. I. Sect. II. clause 3. And the force of these words, so long as they continue to have any force, as we have already shown, bears against the slave system and not in its favor.

It seems to us that the framers of our Constitution finding they had not the power to abolish slavery, were determined to do the next best thing—*not commit the national government to its support*. We beseech all who think otherwise, to review the whole subject, and carefully distin-

guish between the Constitution, and the subsequent legislation of Congress, and the subservient procedure of some of the free states.

(To be continued.)

THE REV. F. A. COX, D.D. AND HIS AMERICAN APOLOGISTS.

It is well known that the gentleman, whose name is placed at the head of this article, was invited by the managers of the American Anti-Slavery Society to take a part in the proceedings of their anniversary meeting in 1835, and that he declined doing so. The simple fact that a foreign clergyman objected to making a speech at a public meeting in New-York, is of itself a matter of no moment to the community, and affords no room for unfavorable imputations on his motives. The managers of our benevolent and religious institutions receive apologies without number, from ardent and devoted friends, for not appearing on the platform; yet in no other instance has an apology of this kind attracted public attention, and become the subject of newspaper discussion. The conduct of Dr. Cox, however, has called forth loud and repeated plaudits on this side of the Atlantic, and has on the other been canvassed at public meetings, and become the theme of severe animadversion. It is obvious therefore, that Dr. Cox's refusal must have been attended with some *peculiar* circumstances, involving considerations interesting not merely to his own reputation, but to the character and success of the anti-slavery cause. His reputation is to us of but little consequence, and we certainly feel no disposition either to assail or defend it, apart from its connection with the anti-slavery cause, and the injurious imputations cast upon that cause by himself and his apologists. It will be seen in the sequel that this gentleman's conduct, and the approval it has received from some of his reverend friends in the United States, involves the question whether the abolitionists of America are, or are not entitled to the open and avowed sympathy and co-operation of their fellow christians of other countries. If our investigations shall

place Dr. Cox in a most unenviable light, and throw ridicule on the plaudits of his friends, they will we trust, result in shewing the utter worthlessness of the opinions of these gentlemen so far as they are adverse to the demands of the Anti-Slavery Society, upon the countenance and support of christians of every name, and the friends of justice and humanity in every land.

Dr. Cox is a member of the "Board of Baptist Ministers in and near London." This body in December 1833, addressed a letter "to the pastors and ministers of the Baptist denomination, throughout the United States of America;" exhorting them as christian ministers to protest against slavery as an "awful breach of the divine law," and to seek by all legitimate means its speedy and entire destruction. On the 25th Nov. 1834, this same Board, with *Dr. Cox acting as its chairman*, passed a resolution declaratory of its hope that such of their American brethren as concur in the opinions of the letter of 1833, will adopt every means consistent with christian principles to diffuse their sentiments, and thus "secure the immediate extinction of their slave system;" and this resolution was directed to be forwarded to the Baptist Board for Foreign Missions in the United States.

In 1834, the English "Baptist Union" appointed Doctors Hoby and Cox a deputation to visit the Baptist churches in the United States. As the mission of these gentlemen would necessarily cost money, the Union addressed a circular to their churches, calling on them for pecuniary contributions. To quicken the liberality of the Baptist churches toward the mission, they were told in the circular "we send our deputation to promote most zealously and to the utmost of their ability, in the spirit of love, of discretion and fidelity, *but still most zealously, to promote the sacred cause of negro emancipation.*"

In selecting Dr. Cox as one of their deputies, to promote the cause of negro emancipation, the Union may have been influenced by the zeal the reverend gentleman had already shewn in that cause, by accepting a seat in the committee of the "British and Foreign Society for the universal abolition of negro slavery and the slave trade." We have before us "The Abolitionist" for August 1834, a periodical published by this society, and bearing on its cover the name of Dr.

Cox as one of the committee. In this number is an address from the committee to the English public, exhorting them to exertion in the cause of universal abolition. "Will you," says the address, "rest satisfied with limited success? will you who have struck the fetters from British slaves, you who have dashed the poisoned chalice from their lips, leave *millions* unpitied and unassisted, to drink it to the dregs"? The same number announces the following among other modes, by which the influence of Great Britain is to be brought to bear upon slaveholding states, viz.—

"*By the mission of properly qualified persons* to these countries, with the view of awakening the public attention, in pressing the public conscience and forming the public opinion on the guilt and impolicy of slavery.

"By originating anti-slavery societies *in such countries*, the object of which shall be the immediate and entire abolition of slavery.

"By moving the various religious bodies in Great Britain to exert their influence upon the religious public of other countries, *particularly the United States of America*.

How far the Baptist delegate was "a properly qualified person" for the mission on which he was sent, will presently be seen. It seems he was not unapprized of the dangers and difficulties he would encounter in promoting the sacred cause of negro emancipation in this country. The Rev. Thomas Price, another member of the Baptist Union, stated at a public meeting in London, that after the appointment of the delegates, and before their departure, he remarked to one of them, "Dr. Cox, you know the prejudices that exist in America against colored people—what will you do"?

The answer was, "I go in the spirit of a martyr." Such were the circumstances, the expectations and the pledges under which this gentleman came to the United States.

He arrived at New-York in April 1835, and proceeded to Richmond to attend the Baptist triennial convention, which commenced its session on the 29th of the same month. In their addresses to this assembly the English delegates did not think proper to make the slightest allusion to "the sacred cause."

The Rev. Dr. Welch, a Baptist clergyman at Albany, of much distinction, addressed a letter to Dr. Cox previous to his return home, and which has since been published in

England. In this strange epistle, to which we shall hereafter revert, the English delegate is lauded for his "decision of character"! We will now give some illustrations of this *decision*.

While at Richmond attending the convention, the Doctor received from New-York a written invitation, to take part in the proceedings of the American Anti-Slavery Society in that city on the 12th of May. About two weeks elapsed, and no answer was returned. "The reason of that silence" says the Doctor, "was chiefly an *indeterminate state of mind*, upon the question of appearing at the Anti-Slavery Anniversary."* To relieve this indeterminate state of mind, he resorted to the following expedient: "It was entrusted to a brother in whom the fullest confidence might be reposed, to invite those with whom it would be most important to confer, and from whose conversation the most important information might be obtained, to *guide* our judgments relative to a public co-operation with the abolition agency, and the society about to hold its anniversary in New-York."† The deputies tell us they found "scarcely any of the *influential* Baptist friends abolitionists;"‡ yet they summoned a council in Richmond, the capital of a slaveholding state, to learn from colonizationists and slaveholders whether it would be advisable for them to co-operate with the Anti-Slavery Society! The delegates have not seen fit to record the advice given by this council; nor was it necessary, as no one can have a doubt respecting it. The result of the council seems not however to have relieved Dr. Cox from his "indeterminate state of mind." He left Richmond without having decided on the course he would pursue, and proceeded to New-York, where he arrived from Philadelphia on Monday. The Anti-Slavery Society were to meet the next morning at 10 o'clock. The whole of Monday, he tells us in his book, was "employed in discussions with some of the leaders both in the Anti-Slavery and Colonization Societies." It was really a pitiable case for one so distinguished for "decision of character," to be thus baited by

* "The Baptists in America," p. 167—a work published by the deputation since its return—republished in New-York.

† Baptists in America, p. 92.

‡ Do. Do. p. 102.

rival partizans, when a single monosyllable, a yes or a no, would have instantly terminated the struggle. But he was environed with difficulties—conscience was urging him to do his duty—the expectations of his English brethren who were bearing his expenses, and his own pledges and avowed principles, were weighing heavily upon him. On the other hand, the advice of the Richmond council, and the frowns of “the influential Baptist brethren, and above all, the apprehension of personal danger, all united in recommending a position of neutrality. It unfortunately happened, that the New-York Courier and Enquirer, the most malignant pro-slavery paper in the city, announced on Monday morning, that Dr. Cox and George Thompson were to speak the next day at the Anti-Slavery Society, and added “we shall not attend the meeting in question, but if we did, it would be to aid in *tarring and feathering the impudent foreign pretenders* who have dared to present themselves among us, to sow the seeds of discord and disunion. Let them beware of the experiment they have attempted.”

A deputation from the committee waited on Dr. Cox to receive his answer to their invitation. He told them that he had been informed within half an hour, that if he went to the meeting it would be at the risk of his life—that he would get *a jacket of tar and feathers*. George Thompson, who was present, replied, that he would go with him and share the jacket. The Doctor however demurred to the proposed partnership, and proceeded to say, “you know there is a political bearing in the question.” He was assured the society had nothing to do with politics; but the only reply that could be extorted from this gentleman of decided character, was, “I cannot give an answer now: send at half past nine in the morning and I will give an answer”!!*

It may well be supposed, that the Doctor’s slumbers that night were unquiet; the next morning, *half an hour* before the Society assembled, he sent the following answer to the invitation he had received *two weeks* before:

“MAY 12, 1836.

“Gentlemen—If I decline the honor of appearing on your

* It is but fair to state that the account of this interview is taken from a speech delivered by George Thompson in a Baptist Chapel in London, published in the London Patriot of 1st June.

platform this day, on occasion of your anniversary meeting, I must be understood to assume a position of neutrality, not with regard to those great principles and objects which it is well known Britain in general, and our denomination in particular, have maintained and promoted, but with regard solely to the political bearings of the question with which, as a stranger, a foreigner, a visiter, I could not attempt to intermeddle.

I am, gentlemen, yours, respectfully,

F. A. COX."

Had the author been a wise man, he would have known, as he has since discovered, that this *cunning* letter was in fact a very foolish one. He has involved his character in perplexities from which it will never be relieved, merely because he had not courage enough to tell *the truth*. Dr. Cox was not sent to this country merely as an abolition agent; he came as delegate to the Baptist churches in the United States. At the time of the meeting, there were many of these churches yet to be visited; and the cordiality of his reception by these churches would probably have been diminished, had he publicly co-operated with the abolitionists. If therefore he believed, as he was no doubt instructed by his colonization friends,* that his attendance at the anti-slavery society would interfere with the primary object of his mission, a frank declaration of this belief would have been accepted as an excuse for his non-appearance. But unhappily for himself, he took other and totally different ground. Again, this gentleman was a stranger to the character of American mobs; he knew not how far their ferocity might be carried; and from the violence and malignity of the pro-slavery press, he had cause to be apprehensive for his personal safety. He moreover was assured on Monday, that he could only go to the meeting at the risk of his life. Now as the *whole* of Monday was spent by him in discussions with some of the leaders of the Anti-Slavery and Colonization Societies, we may readily imagine from what quarter these assurances were received, nor can we be surprised that they produced the intended effect on the indeterminate state of the Doctor's mind. Had he

* It appears that Dr. Cox spent the morning of the Anti-Slavery meeting, in company with a zealous colonizationist, in visiting the *deaf and dumb* Asylum.

under these circumstances told the committee that he was informed by certain gentlemen of great professional and official influence—gentlemen whom he as a foreigner was bound to believe would not deceive him, that if he made a speech at the meeting, he would be torn in pieces by the mob; and that he really believed he could promote the sacred cause of negro emancipation more effectually by keeping a whole skin, his answer, although not creditable perhaps to his nerves, would have been vastly more so to both his head and heart, than his miserable jesuitical note. The assertion in this blundering epistle that he could not make a speech against slavery when requested, because the question has “political bearings with which as a stranger, a foreigner, a visitor, he could not attempt to intermeddle,” was at once indelicate, inconsistent, unfeeling, and untrue. The invitation he had received, was a compliment paid to his character and station, and he returns the compliment by rebuking the abolitionists for their want of tact in asking him to do what would be highly improper. Nor was this all. Mr. Thompson like the Doctor, was a stranger, a foreigner, a visitor, and was known nevertheless to be an agent of the Society, and was to deliver an address against slavery the very day the note was written, and of course the Society was impliedly censured by this foreign gentleman, for permitting Mr. Thompson to *intermeddle*. And how long we may ask, had the Doctor himself been aware of the impropriety of this intermeddling? It is a pity he did not make the discovery in time to lecture his English brethren on the political bearings of slavery, before they raised money to send him, a foreigner and stranger to promote in America “to the utmost of his power the sacred cause of negro emancipation.” It is a pity he did not enlighten his fellow officers of the British abolition society on this subject before they made public their intentions in sending Mr. Thompson to this country, viz.

“To lecture in the principal cities and towns of the free states, upon the character, guilt and tendency of slavery, and the duty, necessity, and advantages of immediate and entire abolition. These addresses will be founded upon those great principles of humanity and religion, which have been so fully enunciated in this country, and will consequently

be WHOLLY UNCONNECTED WITH PARTICULAR AND LOCAL POLITICS.”*

This was published under the sanction of Dr. Cox, as one of the committee, six months before he left England, yet he entered no protest against the mission of Mr. Thompson, nor did he remind his coadjutors that the question of slavery in the United States, had political bearings with which a foreigner ought not to intermeddle. Well—the Doctor comes to New-York, and finds Mr. Thompson, who had preceded him, doing precisely what the Doctor and the rest of the committee sent him to do, and lo ! he now discovers and proclaims that it is improper for a stranger, a foreigner, and a visitor, to intermeddle ! ! He did but reiterate what the whole pro-slavery press had for months been asserting—what brutal mobs had been persecuting Mr. Thompson for, and for which a vile paper had that very morning threatened him with tar and feathers. Little did Mr. Thompson expect, when he accepted the commission and received the instructions of the London committee, that one of the committee would follow him to New-York, and there join with the pro-slavery party in the hue and cry against him, for fulfilling literally and faithfully the object of his appointment.

But it seems slavery has its *political bearings*. The reverend delegate has not condescended to explain the meaning of the expression, and we are left to guess at it. Slavery is sanctioned by law, and so is the sale of ardent spirits, and therefore we presume the question of intemperance has also its political bearings. Yet the Doctor never stultified himself by refusing on this ground to address a temperance society. It is utterly false, that the question of slavery has any such political bearing, as to render it improper for a christian minister to raise his voice against it, in any country whatever. But we will appeal to an authority which the Doctor will not readily dispute. An edition of Booth's work on Baptism has lately been published in England, with a recommendation by the Rev. F. A. Cox, D. D., declaring Booth to be a *standard* author with the Baptists. Now let us see what good old Abraham Booth, one of the ablest writers that has adorned the Baptist church, says of

* “Abolitionist” for August, 1834, page 35.

the political bearings of slavery. In a sermon preached by him in 1792, entitled "*Commerce in the human species, and the enslaving of innocent persons, inimical to the laws of Moses, and the gospel of Christ*," he remarks—"that slavery against which I am going to plead, is not of a civil or political kind, but entirely of a personal nature. For although it is much to be wished that liberty in a civil and political sense may be enjoyed and flourish without licentiousness in all the nations of the earth, yet I never thought subjects of that nature proper to be discussed in the pulpit, and especially on the Lord's day.—But the exercise of moral justice, of benevolence and humanity, being enforced by every principle of evangelical truth, an endeavor to promote those virtuous affections towards our extremely degraded and oppressed fellow creatures, the negroes, must be *completely* consistent with the commands of divine law, the grace of the glorious gospel, and the solemnities of public worship."

Let us next see how this standard Baptist, although a stranger and foreigner, intermeddled with *American* slavery.

In a letter to a friend in Philadelphia dated 31st January, 1792, he thus wrote: "I should rejoice to hear that not only the importation of negroes in your American states, were abolished, as I understand it is, but that slavery itself were utterly banished from them all.—For I have not a stronger conviction of scarcely any thing, than that slaveholding (except where the slave has forfeited his personal liberty by crimes against society) is **WICKED** and inconsistent with a christian character. * * * To me it is evident that whoever would purchase an innocent black man to make him a slave, would with equal readiness purchase a **WHITE** one for the same purpose, could he do it with equal impunity, and no more disgrace. Surely nothing can be more inconsistent than zeal to maintain our civil liberties, and a disposition to deprive our innocent fellow creatures of their personal liberty, or to continue them in slavery when reduced to that abject state."

Let us now follow the reverend delegate in his travels through our country. In about three weeks from the date of this note we find him attending an anti-slavery meeting among the Free Will Baptists at Lisbon, in New Hampshire. "On this occasion," says the Doctor, "I feel it a du-

ty to express myself with DECISION"!* He has not thought proper to give either the resolution he supported or the speech he delivered. We will take the liberty of supplying the omission in part, from another source. The resolution was as follows: "Whereas the system of slavery "is contrary to the law of nature and the law of God, and "is a violation of the dearest rights of man, *Resolved*, that "the principles of immediate abolition are derived from the "unerring word of God, and that no POLITICAL circum- "stances whatever can exonerate christians from exerting "all their moral influence for the suppression of this heinous "sin." The Doctor has no colonization leaders at his elbow in Lisbon; no jacket of tar and feathers in his imagination; and the "political bearings of the question" had escaped from his memory; and this *decided and consistent* gentleman thus delivered himself. "The cause of abolition is one that prospers, and must and will prevail. Yes, "it is written in the decrees of high heaven, that the injured slave shall finally be forever free. If the legislatures "do not look after it, *this will not excuse the church*, for "deliverance must come out of Zion. * * * Brethren, "I sympathize with you in your feelings and efforts, and I "heartily wish you success."

It thus seems that the delegate who in New York was "a stranger, a foreigner, and a visitor," had in New Hampshire become an American citizen, and with the independence becoming his new character, warned the church, that the legislature could not authorize slavery within *her* borders. Aye, and he sympathizes with his brethren in their feelings and efforts. Let us see the value and constancy of his new born sympathy. After an interval of a few weeks we find this gentleman who in New-York turned his back on the meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society, now honoring with his presence the pro-slavery meeting in Faneuil Hall, Boston, at which the most wicked and calumnious reproaches were heaped upon the abolitionists. At this meeting he tells us, "an effect perfectly electrical was produced by a reference to Washington as a SLAVEHOLDER"; and "the Hon. H. G. Otis expended much critical acumen in so elucidating the Scriptures as to reconcile slavery with the word of God."

Verily we think the Baptists in England might as well have saved the money they expended in paying the Rev. F. A. Cox, D. D. for promoting in America to the utmost of his ability, "the sacred cause of negro emancipation."

We now take leave of our sympathizing friend, to pay our respects in a few words to his American apologists.—Dr. Cox on his return home was to give an account of his mission, and he would find it convenient to be well furnished with certificates, in favor of the very peculiar mode he had adopted of promoting negro emancipation; and such certificates were accordingly provided, and are published in the Doctor's book, for the two fold purpose of justifying his conduct, and enlightening the English public on the impropriety of foreign interference. We have room only to notice some of them.

The President of the Baptist convention, the Rev. S. H. Cone, a zealous colonizationist, writes a letter, in which, after praising the conduct of the delegation in relation to the abolition question, he pronounces the following oracular dictum: "Did Englishmen know that the question as now presented, is equivalent to the question '*shall the Union be dissolved?*' they would see that foreigners could not safely enter upon its discussion." Wonderful discovery! The question whether slavery is sinful and ought immediately to be abolished, is equivalent to the question whether the present American confederacy shall be dissolved. Abolitionists have never expressed a wish for the rupture of the Union, nor would its rupture affect in the slightest degree the great principles for which they are contending. Were the confederacy resolved to-morrow into its original elements, they would still with unabated zeal maintain the sinfulness of slavery and the duty and safety of its immediate abolition. This gentleman who is so anxious for the preservation of our Union, that in his opinion an English minister of Christ, when on our soil ought not to declare the whole counsel of God, is we believe an Englishman himself; and unless we greatly mistake his character, he would not with all his love for the Union, were it possible, prevent its utter wreck by baptizing an infant. Our esteem for him would be greatly lowered, did we believe him capable of sacrificing any of his religious principles from motives of political expediency; and we regret

that he should propose such motives for a similar sacrifice on the part of others.

It was quite in order that the certificate of the president of the convention should be countersigned by the secretary, and accordingly the Rev. Howard Malcom also writes a letter. We have already adverted to the pro-slavery meeting in Faneuil Hall, at which the Scriptures were wrested to prove the divine right of slaveholding. Fifteen hundred signatures were appended to the call, for this unholy meeting; but on this dark scroll was inscribed the name of only ONE minister of the Lord Jesus Christ, and that name was HOWARD MALCOM. No wonder that the Baptist minister who could unite in calling such a meeting, should praise the Baptist delegate who attended it. Enough of Howard Malcom.

A third certificate is given by the distinguished, eloquent, and we trust, pious Dr. Welch of Albany. This gentleman, judging from his letter, is one of those happy christians who

"Live while in, above the world."

Aye so far above it, as to hear nought of its hum and bustle, and to see nought of its wicked deeds. No newspaper we should suppose, ever strays within the precincts of his study; no pamphlet allures his gaze from the time-honored tomes which load the shelves of his library. In his researches into the opinions of other days, he has found authors who condemn slavery as anti-christian, and in the same honest simplicity of heart with which he lauds Dr. Cox's "decision of character," he takes for granted, and therefore asserts that slavery is *now* universally abhorred. Let us hear his testimony—testimony be it remembered published in London, for the edification of British Baptists and others, who may ignorantly suppose that the abolitionists here need any aid or countenance in promoting "negro emancipation."

"Slavery is felt *universally* to be a *curse* to the country, deprecated and lamented in *every* part of the Union. There is not I am persuaded, a wise and good man in the states who does not earnestly desire the emancipation of the shamefully and long degraded African. Our *statesmen* seek the means of wiping out this foul blot from our *national* escutcheon. The wisdom of our *legislators*, and the pens of our *scribes*, and the prayers of our *churches*, and the ministry of our *divines*, have long been directed

“to this subject; but it is still to us a question as difficult
 “as it is distressing. It is not *now* with us a question
 “whether a man may innocently hold property in his fel-
 “low man, nor whether slavery is a sin; whether the in-
 “terest and happiness of the white man are in any way pro-
 “moted by enslaving and oppressing the black—reason, re-
 “ligion, humanity and the intelligence of the people of this
 “country, with *united voice*, have long since decided these
 “questions, and there is *but one feeling* and *one opinion*
 “among all who fear God and love their country, and en-
 “ertain intelligent views of its true interest. * * * * *
 “The *whole* country, and *more especially the southern*
 “*states*, as certainly groan under the pressure of their slave
 “population, as the colored man groans under his bondage.”

It is evident that Dr. Welch sacrifices no time to the pe-
 riodical literature of the day. He reads no abolition jour-
 nals, he knows nothing of congressional debates and guber-
 natorial messages; nor does he trouble himself with the
 proceedings of Presbyteries, General Assemblies, and Me-
 thodist Conferences. It is, however, a little extraordinary,
 that he should be so wholly engrossed by the immediate
 duties of his profession, as not to have leisure to peruse the
 official documents issued by his own denomination. Pos-
 sibly his admiration for “the decision of character” mani-
 fested by his English friend, may induce him to cast his
 eye over these pages, and in that case we would take the
 liberty of informing him, that the Baptist Register states the
 number of Baptist churches in the *slave* states at 3007, and
 the number of communicants at 217,513. We would far-
 ther inform him, that the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions,
 in a letter dated “Baptist Missionary Rooms, Boston, Sept.
 1, 1834,” and addressed to “the Board of Baptist Ministers
 in and near London,” expressly and unequivocally assert
 that the Baptist brethren in the southern states “**ARE GENE-
 RALLY BOTH MINISTERS AND PEOPLE, SLAVEHOLDERS.**”
 We hope this intelligence, strange, unexpected, and grievous
 as it must be to the Doctor, will not lead him to do injustice
 to the southern Baptists by supposing for a moment that
 they are sinners above all men; for we can assure him,
 however incredulous he may be, that they have the counte-
 nance and example of “Statesmen,” and “Legislators,” and
 “Scribes,” and “Churches,” and “Divines,” of almost every

religious and political faith. Whether all these "fear God and love their country" we cannot inform him; but we will furnish him with a single fact out of an abundant stock in our possession, which we hope will enlighten him a little as to the position occupied by his own church in relation to slavery. "The Charleston Baptist Association" presented a memorial to the Legislature of South Carolina at its last session, apparently with the view of forming an alliance between church and state for the protection and perpetuation of slavery. From this memorial we extract the following:—

"The undersigned would further represent that the said association does not consider that the Holy Scriptures have made the fact of slavery *a question of morals at all.* * * * * * The question it is believed, is purely one of political economy. It amounts in effect to this—WHETHER THE OPERATIVES OF A COUNTRY SHALL BE BOUGHT AND SOLD, AND THEMSELVES BECOME PROPERTY, AS IN THIS STATE; OR WHETHER THEY SHALL BECOME HIRELINGS, AND THEIR LABOR ONLY BECOME PROPERTY, AS IN SOME OTHER STATES. In other words, whether an employer may buy the whole time of the laborers at once, of those who have a right to dispose of it, with a permanent relation of protection and care over them, or whether he shall be restricted to buy it in certain portions only, and subject to their control, and with no such permanent relation of care and protection. THE RIGHT OF MASTERS TO DISPOSE OF THE TIME OF THEIR SLAVES HAS BEEN DISTINCTLY RECOGNIZED BY THE CREATOR OF ALL THINGS, WHO IS SURELY AT LIBERTY TO VEST THE RIGHT OF PROPERTY OVER ANY OBJECT, IN WHOMSOEVER HE PLEASES. * * * * * As it is a question purely of political economy, and one which in this country, is reserved to the cognizance of the state governments severally, it is further believed, that the state of South Carolina alone, has the right to regulate the existence and condition of slavery within her territorial limits; and should resist to the utmost every invasion of this right, *come from what quarter and under whatever pretence it may.*"

LAND PIRACY.

BY THE EDITOR.

The History of VIRGIL A. STEWART and his adventure in capturing and exposing the great "Western Land Pirate" and his gang, in connection with the evidence, &c. Compiled by H. R. Howard. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1836. 12 mo. pp. 273.

It is a very common mistake to suppose that slavery verges towards a violent catastrophe just in proportion as the black preponderates over the white population. It may fairly be questioned whether a relative increase of the whites would not hasten such a catastrophe, rather than the reverse. The revolution of St. Domingo was not occasioned by the great disproportion of blacks; on the other hand, so far as this disproportion operated to give each and all of the whites a strong interest in the maintenance of slavery, it was favorable to its continuance. Where the two classes, as in our own slaveholding states, are about evenly divided, there must of necessity be a large proportion of whites who are not directly interested in the continuance of slavery. As it is of the nature of slavery to make free labor disreputable, the class of non-slaveholding whites within the atmosphere of slavery, must live by preying, in some form or other, upon the profits of the slaveholders.—Slaves more than any other property tend to accumulate in masses. The holder of a dozen negroes, even with his own industry, would find himself poorly prepared to compete in the market with the holder of a hundred, but he must be a nabob too. His dozen negroes have annihilated his industry, and the consequence will be that when their idle master has eaten up more than their profits, they must go to increase the hundred. The master of course will be added to the ever increasing number of gentlemen whose appetite for the common plunder greatly exceeds their means of getting at it. To this class belong the horse-racers, cock-fighters, gamblers and speculators in general, who swarm throughout the South and contrive to relieve the great slaveholding planters of any inconvenient plethora. The more numerous this class, the more needy, and the more needy the less scrupulous about the morality of its mode of preying upon the great "domestic institution" of its coun-

try. It is by no means difficult to conceive, that it may ere long become sufficiently hungry and audacious to give serious trouble to the security of slave property itself.—Hence perhaps some part of the anxiety of the planters to open Texas; it will relieve them for the present of these leeches. It is in the opening of a wilderness by slavelabor that they find the most abundant opportunities to fill themselves.

The work whose title we have placed at the head of these remarks, will amply serve to illustrate their meaning.—Whatever may be thought of the truth of Virgil A. Stewart's story, the credit it has gained in the region where its scene is laid, is abundant proof that causes are at work in southern society, which if they have not produced this, must of necessity produce similar conspiracies. It is absolutely incredible that a disclosure so disgraceful to the South should be there believed, and the work in which it is embodied should there be tolerated, unless a foundation for it existed in the elements of southern society. The volume just got up by the Harpers goes chiefly we are informed to the southern market.

Virgil A. Stewart, the hero of this story, boasts to have entrapped the leader and master-spirit of a conspiracy among the class to which we have referred, extending throughout all the slave States, and which has been ripening the last eight years. The object of these conspirators has been to prey upon slave property, and they have adopted the following ingenious mode. Slaves are enticed away from their masters by the promise of their liberty, and are instructed how to act their part. They are passed through the clan to a distant place and then sold, but immediately afterwards re-stolen, carried further, and sold again. After playing at this game as long as they think safe, the conspirators destroy the principal evidence of their theft by murdering the negro! On the loss of two negroes by the *Rev. John Henning*, of Madison co. Tennessee, suspicion rested upon one of his neighbors by the name of Murrell. Virgil A. Stewart volunteered to pursue Murrell, who had started towards the Mississippi river, in order to discover whether he would take the negroes into his possession. Overtaking Murrell, to whom he professes to have been a stranger, he passed with him for the hunter of a

stray horse, got directly into his confidence, and agreed to accompany him into Arkansas. Murrell soon communicated, not only the theft of parson Henning's negroes, but an extended system of negro stealing which had been going on for years, and a plan for exciting a general insurrection of the slaves throughout the south-west, which was to be consummated on the 25th of December, 1835. Stewart, professing great admiration of the plan, accompanied Murrell to the general council of his confederates on an island in the Mississippi, and there made a speech greatly in commendation of their enterprise, which was well received. On his return Murrell gave him a list of the leading conspirators, which for the *want of sufficient paper* to write the names on, extended only to *four hundred and fifty* persons, from 16 to 60 being given in each slave state. It is worthy of remark that no names were given *except in the slave states*.

Stewart lost no time, after his return, in having Murrell arrested on the charge of negro-stealing. On this charge he was condemned to ten years confinement in the penitentiary of Tennessee, upon the testimony of Stewart. According to the statements of the latter, the moment he was known to have betrayed Murrell, he became the object of the murderous hatred of the whole clan, of whom Murrell was the principal leader. They set all manner of traps for his life; they hired the people with whom he boarded to poison him; they waylaid him and beset him, three to one, with rifles and pistols. After finding that there was no safety for him in the southern country, being sorely wounded in an encounter with some of the clan, he resolved to flee to a foreign land, having committed his papers relative to the great conspiracy to the hands of a friend for publication. On his arriving at New Orleans, however, his friends persuaded him to turn back, on account of his *health*, to Cincinnati. In that city, during the winter of 1834-5 they jointly prepared and published "The Western Land Pirate." This pamphlet did not receive full faith at the North—and according to the present work, its credit was vigorously if not successfully opposed at the south. To show into what a state it threw the elements of southern society, we refer to the following passage on page 205 :

"During this suspense of public opinion, the friends of

“Murrell and his clan, who had been exposed and held up to public odium, lost no time in endeavoring to discredit the publication and slander its author. Matthew Clanton and Col. Jarrot, the reputed friends of Murrell, united all their powers for the destruction of Mr. Stewart’s character; and as drowning men struggling for the last gleam of hope, they entered the field bearing the arms of slander and perjury. At their heels were found *murderers, thieves and refugees*, brandishing their envenomed weapons of destruction. The dark mantle of infamy was just closing on them forever. After rallying all the forces of vice and corruption, they resolved to make one united and vigorous effort in a desperate cause. From such a combination what but slander and detraction could be expected? They sallied forth with an abusive and malicious pamphlet, impeaching the honor of Mr. Stewart; and as that pamphlet *may have obtained some circulation*, it may not be amiss to give it here a passing notice.”

We do not propose to enter into this profound controversy, but merely to indicate the standing at the South of “murderers, thieves, and refugees.” They write pamphlets which obtain “some circulation.” They frequently occupy the highest posts of southern society. The truth of this proposition by no means rests upon the sole testimony of Stewart and his biographer. They state only what we knew before. Their book, whether true or false, may be used as a sort of gauge to show the villany of a slaveholding community. If false, still what must be the state of society where *such* an imposture could meet with so great success? Multitudes at the south believe the whole, of course security must be a stranger to their breasts; they can have no confidence in the guardianship of their laws.

The proceedings at Livingston and Vicksburg show, that law is not the safeguard of the South. In the present volume we have a detailed account of these proceedings, designed to vindicate the extra-judicial murder of those who suffered. It will be well for the people of the North to understand the grounds of them, and the reasons by which they are vindicated. We will advert only to those at Livingston.

Rumors of intended insurrections were afloat in various quarters of the South, as the natural consequence of Stewart’s pamphlet. The ears of the timid and nervous were

of course very sensitive. It is said that a lady at a place called Beatie's Bluff, in Madison county, Mississippi, overheard *part* of a conversation between her slave nurse and a colored man which alarmed her. The nurse was called up and told that she *must* disclose the whole. She took care, as slaves exposed to torture very naturally do, to make her confession sufficiently frightful to prevent any resort to the lash. A number of gentlemen re-examined the girl, and receiving the same statement gave out that there was "good reason to believe that an insurrection of the negroes was contemplated." This set the country in a blaze, and led to further discoveries directly. One of the planters came before a meeting of the citizens, and stated that he had set his *negro driver* to examining his negroes, who reported to him that one old negro confessed that he had knowledge of the conspiracy. This old negro being brought before the meeting, "positively denied ever having had any conversation with the driver; and the committee, finding they could get nothing out of him by persuasion, ordered him to be whipped until he would tell what the conversation was, they not being informed of its nature."

"After receiving," says the historian of these proceedings, "*a most severe chastisement, he came out and confessed all he knew*, and confirmed in every particular the statement of the driver, &c." How natural the result! The poor old man knew he was to be whipped *till* he confessed, and he did just as thousands have done in such circumstances before him! See the history of the Inquisition. This took place on the 30th of June. The inquisitors followed up this mode of getting evidence till the 2d of July, when several *white* men having been implicated, and it having been discovered that the rising was to take place on the 4th, the "whole community" was ripe for vengeance. This consisted in an "immediate execution of the guilty," who were identically the *witnesses*, and, except the nurse, *all* the witnesses by whom the disclosures had been made!

The "community" then proceeded against the *white* men. One would think they committed an oversight in putting to death their witnesses before bringing the accused to trial. But it must be recollected that the slave laws, in their wisdom, do not permit a colored man, bond or free, to testify against a white in a court of justice. The difficul-

ties of proceeding against these white men are thus stated. "The question became general what should they do with the persons implicated? Should they hand them over to the civil authority? This would seem under ordinary circumstances the proper course. But should that be the course, it was well known that much of the testimony which established their guilt beyond all doubt, would, under the forms of the law, be excluded; and, if admissible, that the witnesses were then no more. If, *from our peculiar situation*, the laws were incompetent to reach their case—should such acts go unpunished? Besides, from what had been seen and witnessed the day before, it was universally believed, and, doubtless such would have been the fact, that these persons would be *forcibly* taken, even from the custody of the law, and made to suffer the penalty due to their crimes. Should they even be committed for trial, there was much reason to apprehend that they would be rescued by their confederates in guilt—if not by *perjury*, at least by breaking jail. They had an example of the dreadful excitement of the evening of 2d July, at Livingston. Immediately after the execution of the negroes at Beatie's Bluff was made known at Livingston, it created a most alarming excitement. The two old negro men who were in custody of the Committee of Examination at Livingston were demanded by the *citizens*; and previous to a vote of condemnation, and a full examination, they were forcibly taken by an infuriated people from the custody of those who intended to award them a fair trial, and *immediately hung*." p. 234.

Whatever was the difficulty of disposing of the accused *whites*, "the citizens" very promptly got over it, for on the next day they had a general assembly of the people of the county, appointed a committee of thirteen, clothed them with full powers of life and death, and before sunset of the 4th, two white men by the names of Joshua Cotton and William Saunders, were disposed of. The former is said to have made a confession under the gallows, that he belonged to Murrell's clan, that there were fifty-one *white* conspirators to raise the insurrection, which was to have taken place that day. All the names of these *that he could recollect*, who were deeply concerned, were *fourteen*, which he gave.

That our readers may have a fair specimen of these ex-

tra-judicial murders, we shall give verbatim, the report of the

TRIAL OF ALBE DEAN.

"This man was a native of Ashford, Connecticut, whence he emigrated to Mississippi two years since. His general character before the disclosure of the conspiracy was not good; he was considered a lazy, indolent man, having very few *pretensions* to honesty. He had previously resided in the neighborhood of Livingston, where he pretended to make a living by constructing washing-machines, until he became acquainted with Cotton, when he abandoned his business and turned steam-doctor, and went into partnership with Cotton, Saunders & Co. and settled in Hinds county. He was known to associate with negroes, and would often come to the owners of runaways and *intercede with their masters to save them from a whipping*. It was in evidence before the committee that he was seen prowling about the plantations in the neighborhoods of Vernon, Beatie's Bluff, and Livingston, ostensibly for the purpose of inquiring for runaway horses, which he did with great particularity—sometimes inquiring for a black, bay, gray, or other color that suggested itself at the time. It was evident that horse-hunting was not his business, but that he was reconnoitering the country, and seeking opportunities to converse with the negroes. He acknowledged that he was in the swamp near Livingston when the notorious Boyd was *started by the dogs*.

Dean was arrested at the instigation of Saunders, who said he was a great rascal, and one of the conspirators. He was brought to Livingston with Saunders, on the 2d July. On Monday, the 6th July, he was placed on trial before the committee; but was in presence of the committee during the trial of Saunders and Cotton, and heard the whole of the testimony which went to implicate him. It was in evidence before the committee, that, when on his way to Livingston, he had asked a witness, among other things, if some of Mr. W. P. Perkins' negroes were not engaged in the conspiracy; and particularly if Hudnold's Ned (a noted villain, whom he, Dean, had often endeavored to *screen from a whipping*) was not concerned. He also inquired if Mr. William Johnson's, Ruel Blake's, and some other gentlemen's negroes were not accused. He was not aware, at the time, that the very negroes about whom his inquiries were made had not only been suspected, but some of them actually hung; and, when informed Blake's negro had been hung, he asked if he had made any disclosures about him. He was identified as one of their accomplices by *negroes* accused.

And, lastly, he was accused by Dr. Cotton, who said, 'Dean was one of his accomplices, and deeply engaged in the conspiracy, as a member of the Murrell clan.' After a cool and deliberate investigation of his case, he was, by a unanimous vote of the committee, found guilty of aiding and exciting the negroes to insurrection, and sentenced to be hanged.

In pursuance of the sentence, he was executed on the 8th of July, with Donovan, and died in *dogged silence, neither acknowledging his guilt, nor asserting his innocence*.

This man requested that his name should not be given to the public, as his father was a public man, and it might lacerate the feelings of a venerated mother, who still survived. This request the committee and the writer would have scrupulously regarded, but that the name of this unfortunate man had already been made public by the *official* and *gratuitous* information of some of the letter-writers, who have already given his name to the public." p. 246.

That man must have an extraordinary bump of credulity, who could swallow all the conclusions to which this tredecemvirate were led by their "cool and deliberate investigation." What had the things which were "in evidence before the committee," in the case of Dean, to do with exciting an insurrection of the negroes? What weight is to be given

to the alleged confession of those who had been already hung? That the man requested his name to be concealed—the man who died in “*dogged silence*”—is too palpable a lie to deceive any disinterested brains, into whatever shape they may have been bumped. If there was any conspiracy at all we are inclined to believe it was on the part of those who assumed the bench of justice. There is nothing in the whole account of these proceedings, except the bare fact that a certain amount of slave property was destroyed, to save a rational man from the prevailing suspicion that the whole was a plot to get rid of some obnoxious individuals, and to strike terror into the slave population. There is just as good reason to believe that members of the Murrel clan sat on the bench as that they hung on the gallows. The whole testimony of the case rests on the bare word of men who had made themselves *murderers*. No legal investigation has been had, since the “excitement,” to clear up the character of the state or the county. And strange to tell, neither Kentucky nor Connecticut, whose citizens were murdered side by side at the behest of thirteen irresponsible Mississippians, has demanded any atonement or explanation. What safety is there, we seriously ask the citizens of the free states who frequent the South—what safety is there for you in any slave state, if it should please any body to set afloat a rumor of insurrection? If you have ever been seen in company with a negro—if you have ever had the happiness to save one from a flogging—if you have ever expressed any doubts of the master’s right to flog—or, even if you have maintained a “*dogged silence*,” and kept your thoughts to yourself, you must die the death of a malefactor—and your murderers will be left to tell their own story,—and yours.

The facts which belong to this sad subject need no comment. On the one hand, the South does not deny that there lives and flourishes in her bosom a class of flagitious and desperate men, ripe for conspiracy and treason. On the other, she confesses that her institutions are such as cannot be defended by the regular operation of law; she glories that her most distinguished citizens will, upon the first alarm of insurrection, set themselves above all law, and imbrue their hands in the blood of their fellow citizens. Do we need better ground for the utter, instant, and eternal condemnation of the slave system?

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

APPEAL to the Christian Women of the South, By A. E. Grimké. Published by the American Anti-Slavery Society, 36 pages.

This eloquent pamphlet is from the pen of a sister of the late Thomas S. Grimké, of Charleston, S. C. We need hardly say more of it than that it is written with that peculiar felicity and unction which characterized the works of her lamented brother. Among Anti-Slavery writings there are two classes—one specially adapted to make new converts, the other to strengthen the old. We can hardly exclude Miss Grimké's *Appeal* from either class. It belongs pre-eminently to the former. The converts that will be made by it will be, we have no doubt, not only numerous but thorough-going.

THE GLASGOW DISCUSSION. The whole of the most interesting discussion between George Thompson and the Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge, as reported in the *Glasgow Chronicle*, together with an appendix by C. C. Burleigh, Esq. has been published by Isaac Knapp, of Boston, in an octavo pamphlet of 188 pages. Some of the colonization and pro-slavery presses have lamented that Mr. Breckinridge engaged in the controversy so poorly supplied with documents.—The fault was in his cause. Its arguments are cursed with a *famine of facts*.—Thompson threshed him to powder with a fraction of the facts which he might have employed.

YARADEE; a PLEA for AFRICA, in familiar conversations on the subject of Slavery and Colonization. By F. FREEMAN, Rector of St. David's, &c. Philadelphia: 1836. pp. 360.

This is a *pious* concoction of facts in regard to slavery, falsehoods in regard to abolitionism and prophecies in regard to the glories of colonization, made according to the latest and most approved colonization juggle, and having in its composition, of course, marvellously little logic. The book we apprehend, with all its pious yearning after the expatriation of our colored brethren, will be rather a drug in the market. But lest we should be thought to deal unfairly by the pith and moment of the Rev. Mr. Freeman, we will let him have a chance to say a word for himself. On page 282 we read,

"It appears to me," said Caroline, 'that the favor of heaven toward the colonies and the cause of colonization, is very apparent; and I wonder that any should dare oppose, lest, haply, they "be found fighting against God." And then the fact that so many good and wise men, who can be influenced on this subject by no sinister motives, some of whom were once unfavorable to colonization, but on examination have changed their minds, are among the warm friends and self-denying promoters of colonization, is to my mind evidence that is almost

"Confirmation strong
As holy writ."

A Madison, a Monroe, a Carroll, Judge Washington, our greatly venerated and now lamented good Bishop White, Robert Ralston, John Marshall, William Wirt, Fitzhugh, Finley, Evarts, Cornelius, Wisner, sainted spirits now in heaven with Ashmun, and Mills, and Carey, and Randall, and Cox, and Anderson, and others who died in the service of Africa; what a noble list might we write of its friends from the catalogue of the lamented dead whose remembrance is blessed! And then the living—what an array of the names of the great and the good come up before the mind!"

To this precious specimen of the *Reductio ad nose-count-endum*, the father of Miss Caroline is made to reply, meekly and piously, as follows:

"Many prayers ascend to heaven," said Mr. L., 'in behalf of the colonization enterprise. It is a cause dear to many a pious heart.'" Piety! alas! We are sorry to see her in such company!

Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine.

NO. VI.—For January, 1837.

THE ballot-box is not an abolition argument. Hence the political parties wasted breath last year in charging abolitionism upon each other as a crime; and they will equally waste breath next year in claiming it is a virtue. Abolitionism knows nothing of parties. It attacks all men as men, without inquiring for whom they vote. It opens its batteries upon the mind and conscience of our common nature, and will play away till the man who goes into office, of whatever party, will, on this subject, have as little desire as he has courage to do otherwise than right.

Abolitionists have but one work,—it is not to put any body into office or out of it, but to set right those who make officers. It is not an action upon state or church, but upon the materials of both. Success will certainly develope itself both through those who make human laws and those who interpret the divine. But it would seem the natural order that it should show itself first through the latter. The interpreters of divine law are, in fact, the chief sinners. They have given license *ad libitum* to manstealing, and it cannot be expected that the statutes of a state should be better than its religion.

Hence, abolitionists will enter carefully upon the inquiry whether or not the christian Scriptures countenance the doctrine that human beings are or may be fit subjects for the right of property. Taking it for granted that these Scriptures, as contained in the Bible of the old and new testaments, are a harmonious whole, they either do or they do not countenance that doctrine. If they do, the believers in a certain "self-evident" truth must fall in with the infidels. If they do not, the visible church, to a great extent,

must fall in with Satan. How every other controversy dwindles to vanity and nothingness in the comparison! Here is the question of all questions. And it is a question that can be solved. A fair investigation will enable any man to decide with absolute certainty whether the Bible does or does not teach the doctrine referred to.

For ourselves, we are ready to stake the cause we plead on the position that the Bible is irreconcilably at war with every manner and form of slavery—that it both saw and foresaw the sin, and laid the axe eternally at its root. Were the wisest of men, with the best light of this marvellous age, to take advantage of the enthusiasm of a people just rescued from the yoke of bondage, in framing a civil polity whereby all kinds of slavery should be forever excluded, and the manifold tendencies of riches to the oppression of the poor should be everlastingly held in check, we unhesitatingly affirm that he could not excel the polity which God gave to his ancient people by Moses—a polity steeped in anti-slavery, drenched and overflowing with kind regard for the poor, the stranger, and the helpless.

And what shall we say of the new dispensation, of which the Mosaic polity was confessedly but the type and forerunner? It is one blaze of abolitionism—a fire which at its kindling burnt up yokes and melted chains. Its doctrines, carried out in the humility and universal benevolence of its first converts, made any *special* attack upon slavery as useless as a candle in the noontide sun.

If we have not overstrained the limits of a fair and candid interpretation in getting at these conclusions, what abominable rottenness must be garnered up within the palings of our most ambitious sects! Real Christianity must—and she will be disenthralled from the putrid carcase to which she has been bound. She will then again breathe freely and go about her work. We shall see, after she gets abroad, what will become of laws declaring *men* to be “chattels personal.”

THE
QUARTERLY
ANTI-SLAVERY MAGAZINE.

VOL. II.

JANUARY, 1837

NO. 2.

SLAVERY, AND THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

BY REV. SAMUEL CROTHERS, PASTOR OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, GREENFIELD,
OHIO.

An examination of the Scripture proof that "the Mosaic institutions recognize the lawfulness of slavery," in a pamphlet entitled "*View of the subject of Slavery contained in the Biblical Repertory, for April, 1836, in which the Scripture argument it is believed, is very clearly and justly exhibited.*" Pittsburgh, 1836. For gratuitous distribution."

THE article in the Repertory, of which this pamphlet purports to be a reprint, is ascribed by current, uncontradicted fame to the Professor of Biblical Literature in the Theological Seminary at Princeton. The circumstances in which it made its appearance at Pittsburgh, and the ground which the author assumes, indicate a change in three respects, within the last year, for which the friends of human rights ought to thank God and take courage.

1. *Slaveholding ministers and their apologists have generally resolved that they will be silent; and that the Professors in Theological Seminaries only, shall discuss the subject with the abolitionists.* This pamphlet was published during the sessions of the General Assembly at Pittsburgh; and was industriously circulated by those members who declared that, in accordance with instructions from the South, they would take no part in the discussion of slavery; and if the Assembly permitted the subject to be agitated, they would leave the house and abandon the Presbyterian church. It would seem from their zeal in circulating the arguments from Princeton, that they were not opposed to having their views defended provided it could be done by

one whom they considered competent. About the same time, at the instance of the members of the Synod of Virginia, the Professors of Union Theological Seminary took the field. In future the advocates for universal liberty will have to fight with neither small nor great, save only with theological professors.

2. *Our opponents have changed their ground.* Dr. Baxter, and the author of the pamphlet before us, declare in substance that if slaveholding be a sin, it ought not to be tolerated in the church for an hour. But they contend that, in itself, it is right, according to the word of God. The former declared, in his speech before the Virginia Synod, that you can never cope with the abolitionists while you admit that slavery is a sin. The latter assigns a more christian-like reason for the position he has taken, viz: to admit that slaveholding is a sin, and in the mean time, contend that it was authorized by the Mosaic institutions, "would bring them into conflict with the eternal principles of morals, and our faith in the divine origin of one or the other must be given up." Hitherto the argument has been, "We are as much opposed to slavery as you. We admit that, in principle, it is sinful, and that its influence is ruinous. But it has been entailed upon us, and Moses allowed the Jews to have slaves," &c. &c. But by the sword of the spirit they have been driven from their entrenchments and compelled to take the open field. This is cheering. We are to have no more whining about our *consciences* and our *unfortunate situation*. The public mind is no more to be shocked by attempts to prove that we ought to live in sin. The man who persuades our children that one part of God's word is at war with another, or with the "eternal principles of morals" is to be classed with infidels. Our professors with a chivalry peculiar to theological professors, or with a confidence peculiar to those who are just girding on the harness, have proclaimed that they will meet the abolitionists, not behind those miserable refuges where their predecessors had concealed themselves for four hundred years, but on the open plain, prepared to decide the matter by the *final appeal*. This is manly.

3. *The character of the contest is changed.* It is no longer merely an effort to put down the abolitionists, and to rivet the chain on millions of the oppressed. *It is open war*

with the God of Heaven. Those who have retired from the discussion used to admit, that although slavery was tolerated in the Jewish church, yet the Scriptures in many places condemn it; and all the perfections of the Almighty are in favor of universal liberty and opposed to oppression in every degree and form. But those who have taken their places are not going to spoil their arguments by any weak admissions. They are going to prove that although the most High glories in the title, *the God that executeth judgment for all that are oppressed*; notwithstanding his threatenings against the sin of oppression, and his many and sore judgments on oppressors, he is himself the patron of slaveholding. And they are going to prove it before the universe from his own word. The matter now to be decided is neither more nor less than the question, What god shall we and our children worship? And if the angel cursed those who held back when the trumpet summoned them to the help of the Lord in putting down the worship of Baal, let those Christians see to it who stand aloof from the present struggle.

The fore front of the battle has been assigned to our theological professors, from the belief that as their time is devoted to the study of the Scriptures and training young men for the ministry, they must be in possession of all the Scripture arguments. We are glad that they have undertaken it. They will either soon overwhelm the abolitionists, or announce that they too are opposed to discussion. In the latter event, slaveholders will perceive that their cause is indefensible, and that they must either turn infidels or break the yoke and let the oppressed go free.

We shall notice but one paragraph in the pamphlet before us—that which points out five ways in which the author assures us the law of Moses allowed men to be made slaves, with the list of texts adduced as Scripture proof.

“It is not denied that slavery was tolerated among the ancient people of God. Abraham had servants in his family, who were bought with his money, Gen. xvii. 13. Abimelech took sheep and oxen, and men servants and maid servants, and gave them to Abraham. Moses finding this institution among the Hebrews and all surrounding nations, did not abolish it. He enacted laws directing how slaves were to be treated, on what conditions they were to be lib-

erated, under what circumstances they might and might not be sold, he recognizes the distinctions between slaves and hired servants, (Deut. xv. 18.) he speaks of the way by which these bondmen might be procured, as *by war, by purchase, by the right of creditorship, by the sentence of a judge*; but not by siezing those who were free, an offence punished by death.* The fact that the Mosaic institutions recognized the lawfulness of slavery, is a point too plain to need proof, and is almost universally admitted. Our argument from this acknowledged fact is, that if God allowed slavery to exist, if he directed how slaves might be lawfully acquired, and how they were to be treated, it is in vain to contend that slaveholding is a sin, and yet profess reverence for the Scriptures. Every one must feel that if perjury, murder or idolatry had been thus authorized, it would bring the Mosaic institutions into conflict with the eternal principles of morals, and that our faith in the divine origin of one or the other must be given up."

We thank the author for the unequivocal acknowledgment that the Mosaic institutions are in harmony with the "eternal principles of morals;" of course any exposition which would bring them in conflict must be false. But we feel pretty confident he will abandon this principle or cease to defend slavery. We also cheerfully admit that if "God regulated slavery it is in vain to contend that it is a sin, and yet profess reverence for the Scriptures." God never regulated sin, nor showed his people how they might lawfully practice it. We wish we could say as much for some ecclesiastical judicatories who professed to act in his name and by his authority. Abolitionists have labored to convince their opponents that these are correct principles; and for saying that those who take contrary ground, slander the word of God, and propagate infidelity, we have been charged with bitterness and fanaticism. Before we notice the list of texts, let us analyze the five ways of slave making.

"By war, by purchase, by the right of creditorship, by

* "On the manner in which slaves were acquired, compare Deut. xx. 14, and xxi. 10, 11; Exodus, xxii. 3; Neh. iv. 4, 5; Gen. xiv. 14, and xv. 3, and xvii. 23; Numbers, xxxi. 9, 35; Lévi. xxv. 44, 46."

"As to the manner in which they were to be treated, see Lev. xxv. 39—53; Ex. xx. 10, and xxi. 2—8; Lev. xxv. 4—6."

the sentence of a judge, by birth, but not by seizing those who were free, &c."

This with some verbal alteration, is the stereotyped account of the law of Moses, by the Jesuits, when the Pope piped "all hands" to his defence in making the African slave trade a divine institution. It is evidently taken from Jahn on Archeology, a favorite author in our seminaries, a thorough Papist, in whose writings are to be found the substance of nearly all the Scripture arguments advanced in favor of slavery by pope's and protestant divines, during the last four hundred years. We do not mention this as proof, or even presumption that *the five ways* are founded on a false exposition of the law of Moses. But in the prospect of being shortly constrained to renounce fellowship with Congregationalists, and some Presbyterians, to preserve our faith and morals in their purity; it is important the churches whom we wish to take with us, should know that there are others of different names and on different continents, with whom we agree. Mr. Jahn's ways of slaveholding are as follows.

1. By *captivity in war*. 2. *Debts*. 3. *Thefts*. 4. *Manstealing*. 5. *Children of slaves*. 6. *By purchase*. He insists that the laws against manstealing were restricted in their operations to those who made slaves of Hebrews.

We can hardly believe that Mr. Jahn and the Jesuits who preceded him, adopted these *five ways* of turning human beings into property, as the result of prayerful and successful study of the Word of God; for it seems they had just enough of Bible knowledge to spend their hours of devotion in counting beads and worshipping the Virgin Mary! The truth is, they are just so many props invented originally for the special purpose of supporting the African slave trade; and handed down to us as holy institutions given to the church at Mount Sinai. And we are indebted for them to the same kind of men who used to sell quills out of the wings of the angel Gabriel. As proof, we need only mention the fact that no exposition ever gave such a view of the law of Moses, prior to the commencement of the slave trade.

If this pamphlet be a fair sample of the instruction which our young men receive at Princeton; so far as servitude and human rights are concerned, they are not a hair's breadth

in advance of the morality which prevails on the coast of Guinea, and in all those petty kingdoms and hordes in Africa where the slave trade is in operation. No one will ask for the proof that in those regions, they enslave captives, and those who are born of slave parents. But there may be sceptics as to the other three ways. With all that we have heard of the brutalized condition of Africa, we may not all be prepared to believe that the poor man who cannot pay his debts, and he who has committed a crime and he whose neighbor is mean and wicked enough to sell him, are all punished with slavery. Any full history of Africa or the slave trade will furnish the proof. In the Edinburgh Encyclopedia, in the articles Ardrah, Dahomy, Angola, and Guinea, we find the following accounts.—“Persons who are insolvent are sold at the pleasure of their creditors—When a man is accused of crime he is condemned to slavery.—During the continuance of the slave trade, the most trifling offences were every where examined with the utmost strictness, and almost every punishment was commuted into slavery.—In all ages, and in all countries, slavery has been as fatal to virtue, as liberty is friendly to it.—The day, says Homer, that makes a man a slave, takes away half his virtue.—Husbands sell their wives, parents their children; friends and neighbors are tempted to betray each other for the trifling reward of a little brandy, or for a mere bauble. Not only do the avaricious governors exact, with the utmost rapacity, the severest tribute from the poor natives, but even make their inability to pay, a pretext for condemning the richest families to slavery.”

How shall we account for it, that the untutored savages of Guinea have attained to the same perfection in the moral system of turning bodies and souls into property, as the Professors in our Theological seminaries with all the aids of revelation and science. Shall we ascribe it to the superiority of African intellect? No; our professors say they obtained theirs by diligently studying the Word of God. The Africans obtained theirs by intercourse with some worthless foreigners who taught them to make money by setting up a traffick in human bodies; and then the *five ways* became as necessary to its support as air is to breathing.

We have one question to ask of the author of the “view of slavery”; and unless it can be answered satisfactorily to

the churches it requires no spirit of prophecy to say, that the days of Princeton seminary are numbered. Does the Professor of Biblical Literature believe that these five ways of making men slaves are a part of *the whole counsel of God* as revealed in the law of God by Moses, and are they a part of the Biblical instruction by which he is preparing our Missionaries for foreign lands? If so—we may expect to hear that through their labors, the slave trade in Africa is reviving—that the missionary and his wife are trading with kidnappers, and storming the towns and hamlets around them, in imitation of what they tell us was the example of Abraham and Sarah in Haran, when preparing to go to the promised land. We may soon hear that he is at the head of his 318 slaves, armed and trained to war, bidding defiance to the petty kings around him, and occasionally pursuing and slaughtering them for practicing the divine principle of slavery by captivity. But perhaps these *five ways* are not taught in the seminary as a part of the word God. Perhaps their publication was only a prudent manœuvre for the purpose of abashing the abolitionists, and preserving *the union* of northern and southern supporters of the institution. This is the most charitable supposition we can make. If so—how long will the Head of the church smile on a seminary which resorts to such measures to secure popularity. Let us examine these ways of making slaves.

1. *By captivity.* It is passing strange that men devoted to the study of the Scriptures should be so far in the rear as to imagine that making slaves of captives in war, was licensed in the Jewish church; and that such a license should be placed among the institutions in harmony with the “eternal principles of morals.” The Jews were not permitted to make prisoners of any of the seven nations whose land was given them for a possession “Of the cities of these people which the Lord thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth; but thou shalt utterly destroy them; namely the Hittites and the Amorites, &c.” Deut. xx. 16. Fond as some men are of slaves, they would not have such as could not breathe. The remaining question is, how were they to treat the other nations called the “nations round about” and the “nations afar off.” When they came nigh to a city they were to proclaim *peace to it.*

If peace were accepted, they were to serve Israel as tributaries. If not they were to *smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword*, and take home the women and little ones. Deut. xx, 10, 11. It was to blast in the bud every thing like a disposition to enslave them, that God said, "Ye shall not afflict any widow or fatherless child. If thou afflict them in any wise, and they cry at all unto me, I will surely hear their cry; and my wrath shall wax hot, and I will kill you with the sword; and your wives shall be widows, and your children fatherless." From the simple fact that they might take home those widows and children, some theologians infer that they were to be slaves. The inference supposes that in a land governed by a divine law, where God himself is the chief magistrate, there can be no alternative for the widow and her fatherless children, but starvation or slavery! It also betrays gross ignorance of the laws of Moses. We can hardly excuse a professor of Biblical literature for not knowing that a tythe was taken up every third year for their relief and the support of the Levites; and the gleanings of every harvest and vintage, and the privilege of going into any field or vineyard to eat when hungry, were secured to them expressly by law.

But the question is expressly decided by two inspired men, one under the old dispensation, the other under the new. When Obed, *a prophet of the Lord*, heard that the Israelites were bringing home captives for slaves, he met them and convinced them that it was such a flagrant violation of the law as would unquestionably bring the wrath of Heaven upon them. And with all the wickedness of these apostate ten tribes, they were stricken with remorse, and after clothing and treating the persons most kindly, they sent them home to their brethren, 2 Chron. xxviii. 8—15. Tell us not that the captives in this instance were their brethren, and that if they had been strangers God would have approved it. That maxim—*the heathen are nobody*—is the chief corner stone on which the Pope built the African slave trade; but it is equally at war with humanity and those terrible threatenings of the law against those who vex the stranger. The other decision is by the apostle Paul. The name, in Xenophon and other Greek writers, for the *slave by captivity* is *Andrapodon*. Of course, *andrapodistes* is the name of the enslaver. But the apostle classes the an-

drapodistes (translated manstealer) with murderers of fathers, and murderers of mothers and others, for whose punishment the law of Moses expressly provides, 1 Tim. i. 10.

Let no one say that although the Jews could not take captives and enslave them without sinning, they might hire their neighbors to do it for them. Our professors are not prepared to defend such morality, even when they find it in Jahn. It would suit the meridian of Madrid, where no gentleman need keep a stiletto because he can at any time hire an assassin to take a neighbor's life for a mere bauble. Besides, if the slave, while the bargain was in making, should raise the cry for help, the whole nation was bound to protect him against his master, (Deut. xxiii. 15,) and see to his freedom. It is evident also that the statute which required every servant bought with money to be circumcised and admitted to the passover, (Gen. xvii. 13; Ex. xii. 44,) never contemplated the erection of shambles in the Holy Land for the sale of heathens who had experienced no conversion to fit them for holy ordinances, excepting that of being beaten in a military fight.

This *slavery by captivity* is as shocking to humanity and common sense, as it is contrary to the word of God. It is admitted in the paragraph under consideration that "seizing on those who were free was an offence punished with death." Suppose then that the two parties are equally free when they join battle; and the strong man, of course, overpowers the weak. Now what wizard influence is there, in such a process, which strips the weak man of his inalienable rights, and justifies the other in doing that for which, one hour before, he would have been condemned by the laws of both God and men to be hanged by the neck till he was dead? Unless we can find a command of God for it, we must pronounce it absurd. Have any of the nations of Europe acted on this principle in their wars during the century past? The truth is, there is not a christian on earth who ever pretends to believe it to be right, excepting when the freedom of the African is opposed.

Let us apply the principle to a case during our revolutionary war, of which, the following is believed to be in substance a correct history. Our venerable President Andrew Jackson was taken prisoner at the battle of King's moun-

tain, but owing to his extreme youth, he was permitted to go where he pleased without being exchanged or released. Is it true that we have exalted to the presidency, not a free-man, but an Englishman's slave? Suppose the soldier who took him prisoner should recognize him in the streets of Washington, and yoke him as his property, to some of the coffles that are driven by the capitol daily, to the tune of "Hail Columbia." Would the word of God, and the "eternal principles of morals" bear him through? It seems our seminaries are furnished with long lists of texts to defend such morality.

When we examine the moral tendency of a license to enslave captives we are equally puzzled to see why it should be given, unless we admit, as we are told in this pamphlet, that the existence of "this institution (slavery) among the surrounding nations," induced Moses not to abolish it. If the author of the Sinai Covenant was under the necessity of consulting the tastes of these pagan nations, the permission to enslave as many of them as they could capture, was well calculated to reconcile them to the existence of such a people, and such a religion in their neighborhood. And as the obvious tendency would be, to make the Hebrews fight desperately, it would go far towards recommending them to the favor of the pagan gods. Mars, the god of war, was supposed to look with supreme delight on the bully who could fight like a tiger. But we are sorry to see our author so soon abandon the ground that we must not "bring the Mosaic institutions into conflict with the eternal principles of morals."

2. *By purchase.* One would think, the lawfulness of holding men by purchase would depend on the question—who sold them, and what right had he to do it? Our laws allow us to hold horses by purchase. But the man who buys a horse knowing him to be stolen, is, by the court of heaven, and by every court under heaven, classed with the thief. A minister who would preach that it is right to own bought horses, irrespective of the manner in which the seller obtained them, would soon find himself *in want of a place*. A congregation of horse-thieves would not employ him; for though they might be willing to be villains themselves, they would insist upon it, that the minister ought to be a decent

man. The punishment, by the law of Moses, for him who made property of a man, was death.

It is sometimes troublesome to prove a negative. Our author has given a list of texts, not one of which, has any connexion with slave selling. A thief could be sold by the sentence of a judge, but that is the fourth way of slave making, and must not be confounded with this second way *by purchase*. It is admitted that a father could sell his daughter to the man who betrothed her for a wife; that a Hebrew could sell himself for six years; and a pious stranger could sell himself until the jubilee. But this is nothing to the purpose. Abolitionists have in vain challenged the host of their opposers to produce the text which authorizes one man to sell another as a slave. It is insulting the understanding of the community by a most pitiful shuffle, to point to texts which authorized men voluntarily to sell their own services for a limited time. Such sales take place in every free country, and have been pronounced lawful without a dissenting voice from time immemorial. We have German servants in Ohio, at this moment, where slavery and involuntary servitude are not tolerated. Such servants, from Britain, bought with money, were to be found in all our states until slavery made such servitude disreputable. We take for granted, that, by *slavery*, our author does not mean *voluntary and limited and requited servitude*. This would be as unfortunate a blunder as that of the hero who fought with windmills and fulling mills, under the notion that he was battling with giants.

We are willing to prove a negative. We shall show that it was contrary to the law of God by Moses, for one man to sell another as a slave. We shall not do it by an endless list of those texts which are utterly irreconcilable with such iniquity. Happily for our purpose God has recorded, with the proper judgment, a case which brings the principle fairly before us. We might search in vain the whole history of the traffic in human bodies, for a case conducted more fairly and honorably on both sides, than the sale of Joseph. The sellers were reasonable as to the price. He was a goodly child, yet they asked but twenty pieces of silver. They concealed none of his faults, not even his ugly habit of dreaming. The purchaser paid the money down. And as to apologies, they swarmed like the lice in Egypt. If being professors of

religion, and descended of pious parents, must screen the sellers from the charge of manstealing—if saving the person sold from hardships, and even death, will excuse the purchasers—if the fact that God overrules the whole transaction to the advancement of his glory, and the ultimate good of many will canonize the deed, the sale of Joseph was a very pious affair. But Joseph says—*Indeed I was stolen*. And God has recorded that judgment in his book, that he *who reads may understand*?

But let us take a case still more favorable to our opponents. Our missionaries tell us of a region in India where parents in a time of famine sold their children. The pious English families, to save them from destruction, bought them and established schools and hired teachers to instruct them in literature and religion. Suppose the next ship should bring us news that missionaries, initiated into the *five ways*, had convinced those benevolent families that making *slaves by purchase* is according to the word of God, and that they have resolved to hold these children as their property. A burst of indignation from the whole civilized world would be the result. Every church on earth, from which the glory has not departed, would pray with uplifted hands—"From all theological seminaries and from all missionaries who teach, we are taught to believe, that making slaves by purchase is right in the sight of Heaven, the good Lord deliver us." The Professors in the Seminary at Princeton would be the foremost to pronounce the report a base slander. And they would do it in the absence of all proof excepting the known piety of the missionaries. That is, they would say the young men had too much sense and piety to believe the instructions they had received from their teachers. Until those Professors shall announce that they are able to believe their own expositions of the word of God, when fairly applied, they must excuse us for not believing.

3. *By the right of creditorship*. In other words, if a poor man, or widow, or fatherless child were, through imprudence or affliction, involved in debt and unable to pay, it was the privilege of the creditor to seize and enslave that poor man, or widow, or fatherless child. To the honor of the author, we notice that he has quoted no text as proof; but we think it would have been still more to his credit had he omitted the doctrine itself. As it is taken, however, from

Jahn, who has quoted two texts as proof, we feel bound to examine them.

Mr. Jahn, and the Jesuits who preceded him, quote 2 Kings, iv. 1—a case which occurred among the apostate ten tribes under the reign of Ahab and Jezebel. A pious prophet, who had been driven from his post to make way for more convenient tools in wickedness, had died in debt. And just as Elisha arrived at the house of his widow, directed thither by the unseen hand of God, in perfect keeping with the spirit of those ungodly times, the creditor arrived to tear from her two fatherless children to doom them to slavery. Could Jezebel have found a professor of Biblical literature willing to hold up such diabolical cruelty, as a sample of the law of Moses, she would have established seminaries in every corner of the land, and entertained the professors by the thousand at her own table. The other text quoted is Matt. xviii. 25. Our Saviour alludes for illustration, not to the law of Moses, but to the conduct of a certain king who commended a poor creditor *to be sold, and his wife and children and all that he had*. To make it bear on the law of Moses it is assumed that those characters to whom our Saviour alludes for illustration, must be such as the law approves! in face of the fact that he sometimes quotes for illustration, a steward who was unjust, and a judge *who feared not God neither regarded man*. And the doctrine which they wish thus to establish is one which no righteous man can think of without horror. Historians say that such morality, in reference to poor creditors, is considered infamous on the coast of Guinea. “Another oppressive law peculiar to the Fantee country deserves to be noticed as demonstrating the baneful effect of the same odious trade in human beings. If a person became involved in debt, and either unable or unwilling to pay, the creditor was at liberty to ‘panyar;’ that is, to seize and confine any person or persons belonging to the family, or the town, or even the country of the debtor; and these captives, if opportunity offered, were sold as slaves without any delay or ceremony.”—*Encyclo. Art. Guinea*. Should our missionaries be trained to believe in *slavery by the right of creditorship*, such a custom will not long be peculiar to Fantee.

Had any intelligent farmer asserted, as the result of his examination of the law of Moses, that it licensed making

slaves of poor men because they were unable to pay their debts, we should not have known how to excuse him. But we have learned to make great allowance for professors in theological seminaries. The truth is, they are so busily engaged in teaching the young men theology, that they have not time to study their Bibles. On no other principle can we account for the ignorance betrayed in this pamphlet, of the following regulations, by the law of Moses, all of which are utterly irreconcilable with distressing a poor creditor. Every seventh year the atonement released all the poor, foreigners excepted, from debt, Deut. xv. 1—12. If a brother, *yea though he be a stranger*, had fallen into decay, the nation were required to relieve him with money and victuals without increase, Lev. xxv. 35—39. Under pain of God's displeasure, they were forbidden to refuse lending through fear of having to forgive the debt in the seventh year. "Beware that there be not a thought in thy wicked heart saying, the seventh year, the year of release is at hand," &c. Deut. xv. 9, 10.

We have only to apply the principle, in question, to be frightened with it. Suppose that the present war by our theological professors on the abolitionists, contrary to all calculation, should be unsuccessful, and that the funds of seminaries should fail, and the professors become unable to pay their debts, would it harmonize with "the eternal principles of morals" to seize them as property? We question whether it would be possible to conduct a drove of them through the state of Virginia without an insurrection. Even the slaves of Southampton would rise again at the sight of such injustice and cruelty. Again, suppose that some of our missionaries educated at Princeton, should write home that they are acting on the principle of *slavery by right of creditorship*; and that in consequence of many of their neighbors being unable to pay for food and clothing obtained in a time of great scarcity, they have become the owners of many slaves. Would our professors be willing to own it as the fruit of their instructions? Would they not say that such conduct was at war with the eternal principles of rectitude as revealed in the word of God?

4. *By the sentence of a judge.* This phrase seems to say that men for several crimes were doomed to slavery; and that, so far, the holy land was like the coast of Guinea.

The fact, however, is, that the only man who was doomed to labor for another on account of crime, was the thief who was too poor to make restitution, Ex. xxii. 3. We have often wondered that discerning and honest men could quote this as proof that the law of God approved slavery. With equal propriety they might quote the constitution and laws of Ohio as proof that they legalize slaveholding. It is a fundamental article in our constitution that no slavery or involuntary servitude shall be tolerated. Yet in our penitentiary we have hundreds of criminals doomed by our laws and the sentence of the judge, to hard labor as punishment for theft, and other crimes. Suppose another British Fiddler or Trollope were to pass through our land, and report this fact on the other side of the Atlantic. Would any but such a logician as Hamlet's grave digger infer that the state of Ohio is a slave state? Yet the premises in regard to the state of Ohio and the holy land are much alike.

This text is certainly an unfortunate one for the slaveholder. 1st. It proves that appropriating to one's own use a sheep or an ox belonging in the eyes of the law, to a neighbor, is in equity punished by the judges. Much more does it prove, that appropriating to our own use, the body and soul of a neighbor who has not forfeited the right to his own person by crime, is in equity to be punished by the judges. 2. It proves that dooming a man to labor for another is, in God's estimation a punishment—a sufficient punishment for a thief—and a punishment sufficient to deter others from stealing. It, therefore, proves that slaveholders are inflicting on innocent men and women the thief's punishment; and that those who say that the Africans are happy under it, and that it is favorable to their literary and religious improvement, profess to understand the matter better than their Maker. If the masters, however, are sure that the author of the law of Moses was mistaken, and that they are right, we would advise them to put their slaves through some of the higher grades of punishment, omitting hanging, except in cases where it seemed to be necessary to give the finish to their religious and literary education.

4. *By birth.* In other words, it was a part of the will of God that if the parents had fallen into the hands of thieves, and had chains on them when the children were born, the children ought to be slaves. We object to this, because it

would follow that all who were born under the political slavery against which our fathers rose in 1775, ought to have continued under it; because it is at war with the principle on which we claim our own freedom, viz:—that all men are created free and equal—and that the right to liberty is universal and inalienable; and because it would follow that those persons to whom the law of Moses was given, having been born of slave parents, were Pharaoh's lawful property, and that the Lord punished him for holding that which was his own according to "the eternal principles of morals." If the wrath of God and man awaits the villain who breaks into an African village, and seizes men and women, are there no stones in Heaven or earth for the wretch who breaks into the hut of a poor slave mother, and seizes her little babe before it opens its eyes?

In the name of all who feel an interest in the instruction of our future ministers and missionaries, we ask—do our professors believe that these *five ways* of slave making are a part of God's revealed will? That they do propogate such principles when contending with the abolitionists seems unquestionable. But that they consider them worthy of God, and therefore a part of his word, is not even probable. On the contrary the mind of the author of the pamphlet seems to have revolted at such a frightful picture of the law of Moses, and he thus apologizes, not for himself, but for his Maker.

"Moses finding this institution (slavery) among the Hebrews and all surrounding nations, did not abolish it. He enacted laws directing how slaves were to be treated, &c. &c."

This, with some slight alteration, is taken from Jahn; it is the same story by which the Jesuits defended the African slave trade, long ago. To persuade the world that the law of Moses harmonizes, in point of morality, with that nefarious traffic, they represented it as not being a pure law, but the result of a compromise between Moses and some Hebrew and pagan slaveholders. We almost rejoice that our author has copied so closely from Jahn, as scarcely to mention the name of God as concerned in the making of the Sinai covenant; it seems to have been all the work of Moses. But we can scarcely conceive how a Protestant divine could gravely give us this story, without supposing that in his admiration of the writings of the Jesuits, he had swallowed

that favorite dogma—*shyness of the Scriptures is favorable to devotion. Let us analyze it.*

1. *Slaveholding was among the surrounding nations.* This we can readily believe. Of course they would not easily consent to the existence of a system, in their neighborhood, calculated to excite discontent and insurrection among their slaves. They had heard that the Lord was angry with Pharaoh for the sin of enslaving; that he had executed judgment upon all the gods of Egypt; that he had emancipated his people by "showing signs and wonders, great and sore upon Egypt, upon Pharaoh and upon all his household," and that he had given to the Hebrews that pass-over as the pledge that his right arm, in all generations, should be made bare for all that are oppressed. If an abolition meeting, at a thousand miles distance, throws our slave states into confusion and alarm, what must have been the consternation of these nations when they heard that these emancipated slaves had reached Mount Sinai, and that the *great and terrible God* was about to give them a law which would be a transcript of his own perfections, and in harmony with eternal principles. But the God of Israel quiets their fears of any interference with their *domestic institutions*, by making slaveholding part of the religion of his own people. And he legalizes five ways of making slaves!—more ways, perhaps, than some of the pagans had ever heard of. Let the young gentlemen remember this when making sermons for the South.

2. *Slavery existed among the Hebrews.* Now our children in the Sabbath school know that the Israelites received the law fifty days after they had celebrated the passover. They reached Mount Sinai in about forty-seven days after they had left Egypt, escaping from slavery, and a part of the time hotly pursued by their masters. But our young men must believe that they had been so successful in stealing children by the way, or in trading with kidnappers, that when they stood before the Mount to receive the law, they were such inveterate slaveholders that the holy God considered it imprudent to abolish that institution. And to satisfy them that nothing serious against the sin of slavery was meant by the plagues of Egypt, and that in the many threatenings of his law against oppression, more was said than was seriously intended. He declared it to be his holy

will that slaveholding and slavemaking should be continued in five ways! His people had sufficient experience of that *domestic institution* in the country they had just left; and the prospect which was to cheer up their spirits under all the hardships of the wilderness, was that of soon being in a land where they could have as many slaves as Pharaoh had; or become slaves themselves in five ways—whereas, in Egypt they had enjoyed but one way, by birth.*

Seriously, we ask, is it not high time for all the churches to arise and put away a sin which cannot be defended without such blasphemy of God and his word? Is it not passing strange that with the approbation of those who are most loud in the cry against error and heresy, sentiments should be uttered from our high places, of such infidel and corrupting tendency, leaving out of view the dishonor done to the name of God. Were a Presbyterian minister, intentionally, to prepare his sermons so as to accord with the existing morals of a corrupt church, and the vicious tastes and habits of their ungodly neighbors, he would be solemnly deposed as unworthy of the ministerial office, and as a scandal to the Presbyterian church. What then should we think of imputing such iniquity to the most high God? The truth is—defending slavery is a levelling business. Let any man employ himself in degrading to a level with the brutes his fellow men, including some whom the Son of God *is not ashamed to call his brethren*, and he can soon impute to his Maker things which he would be very unwilling himself to bear. But we do not charge the author of this pamphlet with any intentional impropriety. There is this apology

* Just at the time this pamphlet made its appearance in Pittsburgh, a company of *slaves* arrived there on their way to Liberia. Various reasons have been assigned for the elopement of a number of them during the night. Some ascribed it to their having imbibed abolition principles from some of the members of the Assembly. Perhaps some of the opposite party had been reading this pamphlet to them. If any of them had taken up the idea that these five ways would be considered sound Biblical literature in Liberia, it is not surprising that fourteen of them decamped during the night. The wonder is that a single soul was remaining by the morning light, excepting the poor old blind woman who could tell nothing about her age, only that she was sixteen years old when Braddock was defeated. We can clear the manager, who had the care of them, of all knowledge of their having seen this defence of slavery. He would have considered it in vain to terrify the community with the threat that they should be ferretted out, and sent back to end their days in slavery. For he must have known that, after such a fright, the most expert man-hunter in Mississippi, with his best pack of bloodhounds, could not catch them till they reached Canada.

for which he will not thank us—to write a book to prove that slaveholding is justified by the Bible, without blaspheming God and his word, is among the impossibilities.

In our next, we propose to examine the author's list of texts.

[To be continued.]

ABOLITION, A RELIGIOUS ENTERPRISE.

BY REV. HENRY COWLES, PROFESSOR OF LANGUAGES IN OBERLIN COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE, OHIO.

THE abolition of slavery has a legitimate claim to be regarded as a great religious enterprise. It savors not of fanaticism or intolerance; and the effort to brand it as if it did, is extremely misguided and unjust. It savors not of the selfishness and ambition of a political party scheme—it has no sympathy with such motives—it disdains such measures, and partakes not at all of that spirit. Nor does it hold communion with the wildness of maniac folly or of reckless desperation. It seeks to accomplish a great religious object purely by religious and moral means. It has, of course, a righteous claim to be regarded as a great religious enterprise, and ought to have a place amongst the most purely Christian and Godlike enterprises that have ever called forth the sympathies and energies of the people of God. This may seem to some like bare and bold assertion. Such are invited to the proof. It lies—

1. *In the fact that American Slavery is sin.* The system of American Slavery is fraught with sin against God and against man. This sin is not merely *incidental* to it, happening occasionally as an unfortunate perversion of a thing good enough in itself, but it is *inwrought* into its very nature;—American Slavery cannot exist without sin.—What is slavery? Not merely involuntary servitude,—a thing which the law of God may in some circumstances tolerate;—but something far beyond this. It is unmaking man hurling an immortal being from his high rank as man down to the rank of a brute, a thing—a mere article of sale and

use. This is American Slavery, and this, if any thing can be, is a sin against God and man. Does that man sin against himself who prostitutes his powers to vicious indulgence, sinks himself into pollution, and makes a covenant with degradation? Does he wrong his own soul who scorns immortal life and chooses death? And does not that man sin against his fellow who drags him down from being man, and so far as *he can*, makes him a brute,—who locks up from him the Bible—plunders without mercy his domestic and social blessings—tears away his civil rights, and robs him of that impulse toward improvement and virtue which only can raise man to his true dignity? Is not this sin? Is it not sin to make like brutes those whom God made like himself and like angels—to doom to ignorance those whom God sent his Bible to enlighten, to repel from our sympathies as men those whom Christ died to save? Is not this high-handed rebellion against God an impious attempt to defeat his plans of gracious benevolence? I speak not now of the robbery of that poor man's wages, of the cruelty of that lash, of the toil unrequited and exhausting on the plantation nor of the tearing asunder the dearest domestic ties; I pass these things, because, though most horrid and but too common, it may yet be said that they are not universal. I dwell not, therefore, on these things. They do pertain, however, to the system of American slavery, and wherever you make man a thing, and consign him to the will of an owner, such results will follow. And a system which produces such results, and is always liable to produce them; nay more, which tempts man's selfish nature and strongly draws it toward such results is surely a horrid sin. Of course the effort to abolish sin is a religious enterprise. But the subject demands more detail. I specify then

2. *That American slavery takes away the key of knowledge from two and a half millions of our countrymen and consigns them either to a doubtful and imbecile piety, or more commonly to vicious degradation and eternal ruin.* The proof of this position is furnished amply by our southern brethren. In regard to the first and fundamental fact, that they take away the key of knowledge, their laws both create and prove it. And what is still worse, the law is an index of the people's will, and proves therefore that at least a majority heartily concur in the measure, and will faith-

fully carry it out in practice. Of course, slaves must live and die in gross ignorance. That their piety is generally doubtful, and always imbecile, requires no labored proof.—Of course, piety combined with ignorance is imbecile—it can neither have much power over the individual himself, nor over others. And in such a case, piety can hardly fail to be doubtful. How can his piety be sure who knows little of himself and less of God, of Christ, and of the way of salvation? Besides, the whole system under which he comes up has trained him to deceive, and may he not deceive, not his Christian teachers only, but himself? The declaration of Dr. Nelson,* has much natural probability. He says:—"I have heard hundreds make such professions of love to God and trust in a Saviour, that the church did not feel at liberty to refuse them membership. I have reason to believe they were poor, deluded, mistaken creatures. The concentrated recollection of thirty years furnishes me with three instances *only* where I could say I have reason from the known walk of that slave to believe him or her to be a *sincere Christian*."

Consider also what multitudes are repelled from the gospel because it comes to them through the hands of their oppressors—how many sink down in ignorance and despondency to die in appearance like the brutes that perish, and how many others are swallowed up in the vortex of those vices which are incident to slavery. All these things entitle slavery to the character of the *murderer of souls*. And is not its utter abolition then a religious enterprise?

3. A third fact challenges our regard. *In the case of those who support it, this system cherishes passions which are exceedingly uncongenial to the gospel spirit.* Is it too much to say, that pride, revenge, barbarity and lust are the natural products of slavery in its effect upon those who hold the power? I do not say that every slaveholder becomes thus vicious, or is necessarily affected by these influences; but the fact is regarded as undeniable that these are the natural and the very common results of the system upon the slaveholding community. The testimony of Jefferson on this point will be remembered. The results also are sufficiently manifest. The pride of aristocracy, the spirit of duelling, the heart that can lacerate with the scourge, and tear families asunder in cold blood, and an illegitimate off-

*See New-York Evangelist, for May 9, 1836.

spring like grasshoppers for multitude—these things are not often found where slavery has not been. They are traceable to this cause mainly, and not exclusively to any other. Now these things are most uncongenial to the gospel spirit. They hold no fellowship together. The gospel must make war against them even to extermination. And this war I deem a great religious enterprise.

4. *The system of American slavery involves principles and practices which are utterly hostile not only to piety, but to every benevolent enterprise; and therefore it must be deemed the natural foe of them all.*

Among these I specify the following. (1.) *That it is right for us to practice our fathers' sins.* This is one of the fundamental props of the system. "Our fathers entailed it upon us—it is our inheritance, and what they left us we have of course a right to keep. If they sinned in it, that sin is their own, and for us to perpetuate the system under such circumstances cannot be wrong."

(2.) *That because we have the power, we may rob the poor of his wages and of all legal right to claim them.*

Adhering evermore to

—“the good old rule, the simple plan,
That they should take who have the power, and they should keep who can.”

(3.) *That we may shut out the light of heaven, even the word of God from a class of fellow beings, for the sake of making them better servants to our lusts.*

(4.) In order that the community may endure and sustain this system of legalized oppression, we may exclude from our sympathies and benevolent regards a whole race whom God has made our fellow creatures in his own image, and for whom as for us Christ has died; and all this we may do on no other grounds than these, that they have a darker skin than ours, that we found them and have kept them exceedingly degraded, and that their great forefather in the days of the flood was cursed to “be a servant of servants unto his brethren.”

Now if we may hate one brother for our convenience, why may we not another? If we may neglect the improvement of one race because of their degradation, why may we not of another, and of the whole human family, and leave the heathen to perish forever? What principle can be more

subversive of every great scheme of benevolence, nay of benevolence itself?

(5.) That *for our pecuniary benefit*, we may annihilate the marriage relation, and tear asunder husbands and wives, parents and children at our pleasure. Can virtue ever flourish on the ruins of the domestic constitution? Can it flourish where Christian men can ruthlessly break up this constitution, and fatten themselves on the price of its sacrifice? Can real benevolence, enlarged and pure as that of Christ for ruined men, find place in such hearts?

(6.) That to secure our own gratification the more effectually we may strip of all civil protection those who by natural right, and all right law, have the best claim to such protection.

That the colored race under slave laws are really not protected I need not stand to show. The master's property is protected; but the rights and well being of the MEN whom he holds, are not at all. The law which rejects their testimony against their constituted enemies annihilates their civil protection, and public sentiment sustains the spirit of that law. But who does not know that they, of all others, have the highest claim, in reason and right to be protected? Of what use is law but to protect the weak against the more powerful, and secure protection especially there where it is most needed? This principle therefore stands in deadly hostility against God's law, and against the spirit of benevolence.

Now these principles of slavery are all carried out to a greater or less extent into their legitimate and corresponding practice, and in our system of slavery they always will be. And can this system—such being its fruits, consist with the spirit and labors of Christian benevolence? Impossible.—Then the system is the natural and mighty enemy of benevolent enterprise, and one of the first great benevolent enterprises before the Christian world is to slay this enemy.

5. Our main position is sustained also by the fact that *American slavery is not only a sin, but a sin of giant magnitude and strength*. By this I mean not merely that in the number and extent of its evil consequences and self-created iniquities its name is Legion: I allude not merely to its prolific offspring of oppressions, cruelties, degradation, ignorance and lust; but also to other facts which give it a

giant power of resistance. It is nursed by the strongest passions of the human heart, love of power, indolence, avarice and sensuality. I need not stop to show that each of these base passions is fed and fattened on American slavery. Nor is the inference doubtful that some men will struggle long and desperately before they relinquish so sweet and rich a gratification. But this is not all. The system has the energy and compactness of mature years, if not the venerableness of advanced age. It pleads the names of men whom the nation venerates. It has moulded into its own image the customs, habits, laws and prejudices of a vast people. And, finally, it has fortified itself in the very citadel of our republic, and claims to have taken refuge in the temple of our Constitution. It will not be vanquished without a struggle. The contest will be hard fought, and "the weapons of our warfare must be mighty through God." A struggle of this sort deserves the name of a great religious enterprise. The conversion of a nation is not a greater work, nor more worthy to be regarded as a mighty enterprise of Christian benevolence.

6. Another fact as painful as it is pertinent, is *that this system of legalized oppression is not only practiced in the church, and tolerated by the church, but is in fact so sustained by the church that it lives mainly by her indulgence, and her example.* This specification contains two parts. (1.) That the church as such does justify the present continuance of slavery, and, (2.) That her justification of it does in fact sustain the system, while her universal and decided condemnation would destroy it.

The church as such justifies slavery inasmuch as her members and ministers speak and write, preach and practice in its defence. Excepted, are three or four denominations, less numerous but not less worthy, but the great leading denominations stand firm in justification of slaveholding *for the present.* True they do not justify slavery in the abstract, and there is no need that they should. Nobody asks that of them in order to hold slaves with a quiet conscience.—Until recently it has been supposed that few, even of the most devoted advocates of slavery have justified the abstract principle. The defence of that is a hard case, and by a little metaphysical subtlety they have managed to condemn the whole thing in the abstract most unceremoniously, and

yet justify it most decidedly in practice. And in this manner the church gives slavery her sanction and yet thinks to save her conscience. In proof of the fact I appeal to the action of the last Presbyterian General Assembly, of the last Methodist General Conference, and to the recent communications of the Baptists with the English brethren. The church then as a body justifies slavery.

Now this justification by the church in fact *sustains the system*. In several of the states, the vote of the church thrown into the scale of emancipation would renovate the laws and abolish slavery. In all, the decided influence of the church would rouse and correct the public conscience, and in the language of a southern member of Congress, "make slavery so disreputable that no respectable man can hold slaves." The fact is that the human conscience is naturally galled and troubled sorely with slavery. The whole system makes sad war against both the common sense and the moral sense of mankind, and could not live without the holy sanction of the church. Yes—slavery in a Christian land never can live without the sanction of the church. There is too much conscience, and conscience rebels against slavery too obstinately to allow the latter to live an hour after the church shall have condemned it with her whole heart and voice and example.

Does not the church then need reform? And whose business is it to effect this reform? Whose, but her own? This, then, is a great religious enterprise. Yet more apparent is this as we contemplate our next position.

7. *That this sanction which the American church gives to slavery does greatly if not utterly paralyze her moral power.* How can she plead the cause of righteousness with the wages of unrighteousness in her hands,—or the cause of the poor with two and a half millions of her own poor under her feet,—or the cause of the heathen while she is making heathen of her laborers, nay, of her own sons and daughters? How can she push forward the principles of civil liberty with the practical lie of slavery on her very front,—or spread the light of knowledge and education while she tolerates and virtually *makes* laws to prohibit some millions of her own people from reading even the Bible? "O consistency thou art a jewel;" and a jewel not only most lovely in beauty but most indispensable to the character and efficiency of the

church. Let that man preach repentance to his neighbors who defrauds them as his business every day, and what avails it? And what can the preaching and influence of the church avail, while she tolerates in her very bosom this sin of hydra form and giant power? What sort of conscience can she have, while it is cultivated under such a regimen, and what sort of influence in rebuking sin and recommending holiness? How much of the *blessing* of Christ can she have while she thus prostitutes his name, and renounces his spirit? Oh! my heart sickens under the conviction that the church is dead and must rot in her moral grave, until she shall wake to the life and power of righteousness in regard to this great sin. This effort to resuscitate the church I must regard therefore as a great religious enterprise, vital to her moral energy and action.

8. I take my last position on this point. *American slavery is a mighty barrier against the success of the gospel.* The American church has promised much and sustains vast responsibilities. The name, *American*—her commerce opening every land to her access—her wealth, princely and competent to the work, her resources of men and mind fully adequate—all concur to fix the eyes of men and of angels on her as the instrument under God for the conversion of the world. And will she do it? Is she girding herself to the work? Ah! *can* she do it, with the pollutions of slavery on her hands—with the price of blood in her offerings—with the paralysis of slavery upon her conscience and with its lie against all righteousness and benevolence in her example? Impossible. However much Christians beyond the waters may do, and those in our land who have come out from the midst of slavery and washed their hands of its participation, the barrier yet remains. The drawing back of the American church, which ought to be first and foremost, throws a heavy chill over the spirit of practical benevolence. The church thus casts herself as a vast stumbling block across the high way of the Lord, and her prophets cry “cast ye up, cast ye up, prepare the way, take up the stumbling block out of the way of my people.” And this is a great religious enterprise. Who can deny it? Who can fail to see and feel it?

II. Having thus rather stated, than fully illustrated certain facts as proof of my first position, I pass to another view

of the subject, and take the ground *that the friends of the cause of abolition ought to prosecute it as a religious enterprise.*

I am aware that to no small extent this has been done. This enterprise originated in Christian benevolence. Its corner stone was laid with faith and prayer. Many, yea most of its advocates have warmed and sustained their hearts with the spirit and the faith of Christ, as they have toiled on amidst suspicion and rebuke, against insensibility and opposition. Yet there has been some party feeling and some asperity. Possibly it may have been, for the moment, forgotten that this cause is the cause of God—is really a great religious enterprise, and ought to be prosecuted as such and as nothing else. Be this as it may, my brethren will bear with me in a word of exhortation touching this point, in giving which I would not be understood to assume that they are especially guilty of departing from the course recommended.

I take the ground that the friends of this cause ought to prosecute it as a religious enterprise

1. *Because it is such in its nature, and ought to be treated according to what it is.* Its nature has been sufficiently shown. If we would bring forward this cause with strength, it must be in its own true character. It must stand on its real merits. The nation must see it as it is. And they *ought* to see it as it is. We as honest men are bound to show them. And we have no occasion for concealment. No; let the southern people and the world know that this is a religious enterprise; that our religious principles demand it of us; that for the love we bear to Christ and to the souls of the oppressed, we cannot hold our peace. Yet further. Here lies the strength of our cause. It is a controversy against sin, and never can succeed except by the power of truth and holiness. Then let us clothe it with this power, and hold it forth before the world as it is.

2. *Allow me to suggest that in prosecuting the cause in this way, we shall more surely and more easily keep our hearts in that humble, tender frame which is always requisite in the reprovers of sin.* It is obvious that reproof is rarely effectual unless given with great meekness and tenderness of spirit. The reprovcr must not feel himself to be without sin and above all condemnation. Rather let

him regard himself as deeply guilty, if not of the sin which he reproves, yet of many others perhaps not less odious before God. This conviction may save him from censoriousness and pride in exposing the sins of others.

Again, we are creatures of sympathy, especially in regard to that ill feeling of *resistance*. Resisted ourselves with harshness, we are exceedingly prone to catch the same spirit. We see human nature developed thus in the numberless quarrels and disputes that occur in the every day business of life. So that abolitionists must be more than men, if, before this omnipresent temptation, they never fall. The grand preservation against falling is, doubtless, to feel that you are doing the work of Christ, *and must by all means do it in his spirit*. You are not fighting a political warfare, nor contending for victory. You seek only to do away a great sin so that the Gospel of Jesus may have free course, and God be glorified in saving a multitude from ignorance, vice and hell. Imbue your mind with this object, go forth with much prayer and faith, and you may be kept in safety.

Another circumstance in this case enhances the difficulty of giving reproof. The sin itself is so heinous in many points of view, as to wake up feelings of perfect indignation. This we are in danger of transferring unconsciously from the sin itself to the person of the guilty. Now do not suspect me of holding the strange doctrine that sin is a sort of abstraction which can be condemned and punished while the sinner goes free—but I say these two things: that we may have indignation against a sin and pity for the sinner, for Christ has: and second, that we may condemn a sin unsparingly, without condemning whole classes of men indiscriminately. The least appearance of injustice, on our part, is magnified and blazoned against us as if there were no other means of defending slavery. Against these dangers the spirit of Christ is the best antidote. Let us feel that our object is to abolish sin by convincing and reclaiming the offender, and that we ought to pity him and, by all means, never exaggerate his offence. This is laboring in the right spirit, and it affords great hope of success.

3. *We shall thus secure the co-operation of most, if not all, the real piety in the land.* I will not disguise the fact that some have been, for a season, repelled from sympathy

and union with the abolitionists by the asperity, real or imaginary, which they have been supposed to exhibit. Now any occasion of this nature is deeply to be deplored. It ought not to be—it need not be. Only let the benevolence of the Gospel sway our hearts, and love and compassion would soften our reproofs and denunciations of even this enormous sin. Let it be made purely a religious enterprise, and no real Christian, walking in the spirit of his Master, could be repelled. No; such would rally at once when the standard of the cross was lifted up. Let them see that this is the work of Christ, the cause of his kingdom, and you appeal to all they hold most near and dear. They will see this to be their *own work*. They will recognize it as the very thing for which they have long prayed, and long desired without knowing how to do it, or even find it. The great cause of abolition will stand forth before them in a new light, and they will hail it as their own. Let me allude to a fact. Thousands have been made abolitionists by the mobs. How? Partly through sympathy for the persecuted which led them first to examine and then embrace; but mainly because they saw all their civil and social rights in jeopardy. The appeal was made to their spirit of liberty, and they could not resist it. The cause of abolition stood forth before them as the cause of human rights—the cause of freedom against slavery, and of law against anarchy; and their election was soon made. Now let the cause of abolition stand out before a Christian in its own true light, as a religious enterprise, and you make a similar appeal to him. As he loves Christ and the cause of Christ, he cannot resist it. He comes with all his heart. His piety draws him. He neither would, nor can refuse. Happy the day when the strength of American piety shall be enlisted in this great work. It can be done—and it will be. Then, and not before, the great question will be carried—the great and good cause will triumph.

4. *No power but that of God and of his truth can ever accomplish the work.* So I believe most firmly. Political economy is too weak to contend against the giant passions which sustain slavery. So is the principle of fear. The spirit and power of faction can never avail—abolitionists will never try it. The providences and judgment of heaven may wash the stains of this sin from our soil with blood—but against this we pray most fervently. God grant it may

never be. The only mode then in which we wish to have the work accomplished is that which alone is feasible, namely,—by the power of God and of the truth. Let Christians see that slavery is sin and renounce it. Let the public conscience be enlightened and quickened. Let the energy of the gospel of love be felt. Let the glorious efficacy of religion in promoting human happiness and protecting human rights be really seen; and the developement would honor God, and his truth inconceivably. This object alone—apart from the accessions which would be made directly to human happiness, would be worthy of a great religious enterprise. To honor God as the God of the oppressed, and his truth as the salvation of our race, the great antidote for every evil and curse which men bring on themselves and on each other, would be a glorious achievement. For such a developement of God and of his truth, the world has long waited in vain. “The whole creation has been groaning and travailing in pain together for it until now.”

But deliverance is at hand. God’s kingdom shall at length come, and Satan’s throne shall fall. That power by which the prince of darkness has so long chained down the millions of Africa in bondage, physical and moral, must cease.—The sons of Ethiopia are soon to shake off their manacles, and stretch forth their freed hands to God. And the oppressor too shall come bending to the Saviour’s feet, and his hard heart shall melt before the cross for his sins against his despised brother. His pride of power, and avarice and selfishness cannot stand before the subduing power of Jesus. As truly as Jehovah lives, the nations are giving to his Son, and his truth and grace shall bow their hearts, abolish their sins and soften their spirits into the sweet simplicity and tenderness of the gospel. Then slavery will have ceased. Its last groan will be over—its last tear will have fallen—its last bitter cup will have been dashed forever. O what a Jubilee! But I may not give vent to the feelings of my heart. Yet one thing I must say. To the friends of the oppressed throughout the nation, if my voice could reach I would cry.—Be men of God and mighty in prayer, and the cause of God will triumph. Make this a great religious enterprise—make it such in spirit, in argument, in appeal—make it such in all your measures and operations, and you cannot fail of success. So Jehovah will be with you—yea, he himself will be your strength and victory.

THE CONSTITUTION.

BY N. A. ROGERS, ESQ.

AMONG the lions in the way of the "progress" of northern pro-slavery towards the *desirable* overthrow of our republican slaveholding, one of the grimest, most *roarious*-growling and dismaying is the GLORIOUS CONSTITUTION. You cannot advance in direction of the castle of this pet-monster of the republic—slavery—even to reconnoitre, from a distance, its "sublime mysteries,"—but your ears are assailed from every quarter, with cries of; "Compact"—"Pledges to our Southern brethren"—"Guaranty of their peculiar institutions"—"The great compromise." By the way, we of the North, have nothing to do with slavery—absolutely nothing at all—it is a southern affair wholly—we have nothing (compact) to do (guaranty) with slavery (compromise.) Why do you come here to accuse *us* (have pledged ourselves) who are opposed to Slavery, &c. &c. But the absurdities, which grow on every bush, by the anti-abolition wayside, must not tempt us from our brief purpose—to write a rambling, post haste notice of the constitutionality of United States' Slavery. We draw bow at the uncouth monster at venture—currente, volante, no pausing to sight,—no solicitous adjustment of shaft to bow-string as if the beast might be missed. Our light arrow must hit him "stretched out many a rood"—and that between joints of his gaping and unguarding harness.—Imprimis then. Is the Constitution of these Federate States pro-slavery? So they say, and that it barricades it about with impregnable and perpetual barriers. If it be so—if it sanctions the oppression of the colored people of this country, directly or indirectly ever so remotely,—why it is the most nefarious document ever perpetrated by the hand of human depravity. And those revolutionary fathers of ours—if they did (as their hopeful descendants unblushingly avow) enter into solemn league and covenant to enslave the innocent colored people,—were, we indignantly proclaim, the most ferocious miscreants that have profaned the earth since Cain! What! They—reeking hot from a revolution, kindled for universal liberty—inalienable—the in-

defeasible birthright and incident to every body under the round cope of heaven,—a right so grossly self-evident that they would not argue it but with the naked bayonet,—they—the daring hypocrites, when God had given them victory for the justice of their principles—sealed with the blood of the colored as well as the colorless man,—with *Te Deum* on their breaths, assemble deliberately and solemnly and enslave their fellow men!—Are these the ancestors we bluster about 4th July's! Then indeed “has our ignoble blood “crept through” at least one generation of SCOUNDRELS. Why a charter so diabolical should have been writ out in man's blood and on human parchments, and executed amidst accursed incantations around the “charmed pot.” A Constitution, by republicans, for the enslavement of men! An Algerine Divan would not have been caught at it. There is but one imaginable assemblage that would be “up to it,”—a pandemonium, styled, instead of a convention,—and even with Satan himself and his despairing peers, it would have raised a laugh to see men attempt it on the earth—a league to subject man to the boundless caprice of his fallen fellow! Oh! it would have transcended all their expectations of depraved human service—it were a piece of supererogation disgusting to their extremity of wickedness. But it is contended that *our ancestors* did it. It is possible they conceived it in their hearts. Why else did they not demand the abolition of slavery as the sine-quanon condition of confederation? And why did they expressly protect the infernal slave trade from the interference of their own Congress? Ah! they were embarrassed and the South would not unite. But were they not embarrassed when Great Britain would not unite? They plunged to the neck in revolution for an abstract right. They waged war to the knife against a mere nominal oppression. But it was for their own white selves. Rights were not so “abstract” but they could fight for them when they were *their own*. But when the life and soul of their unoffending and most deserving colored brothers were at stake—why, forsooth, they were embarrassed and must “*compromise!*” But they did not succeed in reducing their compromise to writing. If they conceived it in their treachery, they did not get it down upon the deed; God did not vouchsafe them the art to do it. They were after securing their own

personal liberties and it was utterly past all their scholarship to pen the security and leave the colored man a slave. The written Constitution is a warrantee deed of universal liberty,—equal and absolute freedom to every mortal man who comes within its outmost protection and territorial limit. Slavery is unconstitutional. It has been perpetuated in defiance of the old charter every moment since its adoption. A flying consideration or two in support of this fanaticism—premising that we harbor not a spark of care to convince a solitary republican. So we can help summon the stupid public attention to the *nobile par*, Slavery and The Constitution, we care not how the public holds—constitutional or unconstitutional—the sight is one the nation cannot bear.

Will they travel beyond the deed for intents and purposes? If they do, we point them to that “flourishing” piece of “rhetoric,” the famous “Declaration,” and to the state Bills of Rights, as indications of the *quo animo* of the times—concomitant or precedent acts these, and anti-slavery to ultraism. But we hold them to the deed. To this the Declaration was the preliminary “flourish.” Let us see how the sages followed it up. First, the preamble. We may gather some inklings of their *intent* from the preamble—some means of conjecturing their *purpose*. “We, the people,”—not five sixths, but the whole—the *people*. And what goes to make the constituent parts of that we call *people*? a pointed nose? a thin, termagant lip? a larger curling of the hair? a pallid complexion, unburned by the vertical sun? We call on pro-slavery for a definition of *people*. “In order to form a more perfect union.” Union of what? Fire and water? wolf and sheep? fox and poultry? Union! Slavery is as big with discord as a volcano is of combustibility and eructation. But patience—and look a little further. “To establish *justice*.” Not come to the slavery yet. Henry Clay, in a slaveholding speech before a Colonization Society, seems to *justify* it. The American Union* thinks it has discovered that it is, as it were, a “wrong.” But further, “to secure domestic tranquility,” among the masters? “What makes the mother hug her infant closer to her breast as she hears the midnight bell at Richmond,”

* The nom de guerre of Colonizationists, in and about Boston.—Ed.

cried the mad Randolph, as he disclosed the tranquilizing influences of negro insurrections. Domestic tranquility! The war whoop, as the old settlers used to tell, scared the frontier mothers as, sharp and quick, it "broke the sleep of the cradle." But what is dread of Indians to the dismay of the heartless woman of the South, when she hears the alarm of a slave rising? What imagination can conceive the consternation of the planter? It scares him like the bursting scenes of the judgment day, which it images forth to his guilty, coward soul. It cannot be the *master's* tranquility—but peace among the sovereign states and the sections of the Union. How naturally it springs from the deadly collisions of free and slave interests, habits, feelings and labor!—Surely slavery is a tranquility-breeder among the states and sections! "To provide for the *common defence*." What *defence* does a pro-slavery Constitution afford the colored millions of the country—or are they not a portion of the commonalty. Is the constitutional enslavement of one sixth of the people "*common defence*?" Defence against what? Colored people have become quite *common* in the land, but slavery is no *defence* to them. Defence against foreign enemies perhaps. Gen. Hayne regards slavery as the very essence of national military strength. It leaves the white chivalry at leisure to hunt and fight, while agriculture is kept up at home by the slave. The soundness of this will not here be questioned. But "to promote the *general welfare*," viz. oppressing, degrading, treading under foot, unmanning, unsouling, imbruting, transforming, dismounting of soul and spirit, extinguishing—we want words! here is an unlooked-for and unprovided-for occasion of words of terrible significancy! Slavery demands a nomenclature for her own use! "General welfare!" *General* to a frightful extent. Let the slave speak as to the *welfare*. So *general* has the system come to work, that it will augment itself to its own and the nation's catastrophe, unless anti-slavery makes haste to the rescue. But we come to it at length. The genius of thralldom at last speaks out for itself, "And secure," mark the phrase, "the blessings of LIBERTY to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution." 'Liberty to be sure,' cries pro-slavery, 'but for whom, not for the nigger, but for "*ourselves* and *our* posterity,"—strongly, by implication, excluding the black folks

from sharing it. "Ourselves" were the enslaving preambles.' But "posterity" is a little too general. They should have added *legitimate* by way of limitation, if legitimacy can be predicated of that brothel, a slaveholding community. White posterity—not comprehensive enough, for many a whiter than some of the preambles, pines in bondage. Who are "posterity?" Go to the gloomy gang that drag the heavy foot to the toils of the plantation. "Posterity" linger there rank and file. Go to your federal city and there see the posterity of these constitution-mongers gracing the *coffle*, (that word of sweet import to republican ears,) as it parades the avenues of the capital, to the tune of Hail Columbia, marching to a more summary servitude at the prosperous and fertile south-west. Let that word "*coffle*" sound in the ear of the northern freeman. Let it ring upon the soul of the Church of this republic. Those for whom the Lord died are chained in that hideous phalanx. His professed, perhaps his own real disciples are fettered there. There are the posterity of the framers of the Constitution—of this same "ourselves," and these are the blessings of liberty secured to them by the Constitution if it sanctions slavery.

But to the compact proper, section and article. The second section speaks of the whole number of free persons, and of "three fifths of all other persons,"—*other than free* must be slaves, and thus the Constitution *recognizes* slavery. There was slavery at the time, and the valiant formers of the compact do allude to it in regulating taxation and representation. They speak of it as an existence, but do not provide it or enact it. So they speak, in section 8th, of "piracies and felonies on the high seas," but not by way of institution or guaranty—though they might have done both with comparative consistency and innocency. Section 8th provides that Congress may call out the militia "to suppress insurrection." Insurrection is a forcible resistance to the laws of the land. Against what law does any man rise in vindication of his just rights? A rising against oppression is justifiable self-defence, and is no "insurrection."* An universal bursting of the fetters of slavery from Washington to the hopeful regions of Texas, were no insurrection. If there be any insurrection connected with slavery, it is the rising

* Our correspondent here speaks as a sound lawyer, not as an abolitionist.—Ed.

of the slaveholders against humanity, the law of the land and Almighty God. But this is fanaticism. Section 9th is pro-slavery. It protects from Congress a commerce known, and hunted on the highway of nations, by name of the *slave trade*. It is styled "migration or importation of such persons," &c.—good republican words and fitly spoken. Reader, art thou acquainted with that sort of migration? It is *peculiar*, like the "institutions" in this country which sustain it. There is an account of it by one Thomas Clarkson, detailing it from the seizure of the "*emigrant*" through that branch of it styled "middle passage," and on to his delivery over to final Christian bondage. Our puritan pilgrim fathers called it "migration." The shark attends it over the deep—fit attendant he—cruellest of sea monsters, and of mariners most abhorred. He instinctively scents out and waits on the *emigrant* ship. The peculiarities of the emigration strongly induce him to become party to the voyage. Shadow does not follow substance more industriously and faithfully than this sea-cannibal the *importer* ship. Happy the emigrant—thrice happy and favored of Providence—who falls to the lot of this submarine partner in trade. But this protecting clause was limited to 1808, and has expired. Indeed Congress has since that styled the emigration by a different title, and has given it a different legal effect—prohibiting it, in favor, doubtless, (for it is a protective Congress) of the home market—a kind of "American System" to promote the domestic manufacture of slaves.

Sec. 2d, Art. IV. arrests the fugitive slave and remands him to his prison-house. What says it? "No person held to service or labor in any state, *under the laws thereof*, escaping into another," &c. Any person *lawfully* held to service, ought to be arrested, if he escape. There is no pro-slavery in this, we deny that *slave* service or labor is lawful, even in Carolina. First, we dare question, if the nullifying little state can show a statute on her books, that provides for the enslavement of any human beings. She may have statutes regulating the condition of the enslaved in fact, and against law. But their enslavement is not by law, even in Carolina—or if she has enacted such a statute, it is contrary to her own Constitution, which is republican and so void and no law. Or if not against hers, against

our Constitution, and is no law. Our Constitution, Art. V. of the amendments, expressly declares against the taking of any man's life, liberty or property, but by legal process. But of that anon. Slave service is unlawful any where this side the infernal regions. There it is lawful. There it is constitutional and according to first principles,—but no where short of there. By Sec. 2d, Art. IV. a man flying from slavery, can no more be arrested than if he were escaping a pirate or a boa constrictor. Let "persons" that are fugitive from labor *that they owe*, be stopped and remanded, and it is liberty and not slavery. "The United States shall guaranty to every state a republican form of government." What is this but a government by a majority of the people? The majority in South Carolina are violently and forcibly enslaved by the minority. Is this republican government according to the Constitution? "The citizens of each state;" but stay—we forgot the Black Act of Connecticut, which decrees that a citizen must be white, or he is no citizen. So at least *Justice Daggett* decides,—a second Daniel come to judgment.

Article V. of the amendments. As we cannot amend this, we here after a remark or two close our excursion, bidding, as we do so, slavery and its apologists, welcome to all the consolations of the Constitution. The people finding in their state and sectional controversies they had overlooked individual and personal rights, adopt amendments to the Constitution. First, they guard against abridgment of the freedom of speech and of the press, and the right peaceably to assemble, and the right of petition. Now whether this be directly anti-slavery or not, we aver that the exercise of these rights, will abolish slavery and that the toleration of slavery, will, and has well nigh abolished these. Mobs in the service of slavery, have violated the rights that the Constitution protected from the interference of Congress, and Congress has presumptuously trampled under foot the sacred right of petition, for love of slavery and fear of slaveholders. "The rights of the people to be secure in their persons against unreasonable seizures," would seem to be anti-kidnapping—but pro-slavery explains, by saying that pouncing upon the black man is one of the most reasonable "seizures" in the world, and therefore constitutional to an eminent degree. We give it up. But upon article V. we fasten and shall

hang on upon the *habeas corpus* of the colored man under it, as the Greeks did upon the body of Patroclus. "No person shall be deprived of his *life*, *LIBERTY* or *property* but by due process of law." Ajax Telamon could not spread a broader or more multifold shield over the corse of Achilles' friend, than this broad explicit and absolute clause of the Constitution. We heave it in front of the victim of slaveholding. You can't take his property—even his old hoe with which he delves his rice plat between sun set and dark a Sundays—you can't plunder him of that, without the solemn legal process it takes to arrest the body of your Gen. Jackson for a thousand pound debt. You must have *due process of law*. That process by which free men may be divested of their goods, chattels or personal liberty or life.—You can't construe it away or sneer it away. You can as well argue John Hancock's sturdy signature from the old "Rhetorical Flourish." "No person."—Judge Daggett may deny citizenship to the black man, but he would pause at denying him personality. If the negro be not a person, and the enslaved negro too, then slaves and negro people are not alluded to throughout the Constitution. "Three fifths of all other *persons*,"—"the migration of such persons,"—"no person held to service," &c. "No person shall be deprived of property."—If a black man "labor" for another, is he not "worthy of" and entitled to "his" equitable "hire?"—Are not his justly earned wages, *quantum meruit*, his own, his *property*, as absolutely as a man can acquire any thing by labor? We scorn to answer the knavish objections that will be made to this simple statement of the enslaved negro's right of property. Every cent he earns is his by paramount right, and he who denies it to him is a thief—or worse.—Away with your paltry quibbles about purchasing and inheriting men and their wages and all that palpable particeps criminis with kidnappers and pirates. The negro man's wages are his property before God and man, and he who lays a finger on a farthing to withhold it, the curse of God will rest upon him, and it will eat his flesh "as it were fire." Does not slavery deprive of property without legal process? a brief word presently upon process. It isn't kidnapping by the way. "Of life." Does slavery deprive a person of life? To say nothing of the partial and abominable slave laws (not *slavery* laws) which make acts penal and capital in

the black man which are no offence in the white, of "moderate" slave correction which takes life, of exclusion of the black man from the stand of the witness against the white man—what takes life if slave service does not? What consumes life with a prodigality enough to sicken the strong nerves of a Wade Hampton? Slavery. But it undoubtedly takes "liberty," and is it by "due process of law?" No, no. Every body living in a county where there is a court house knows what is due process of law, and that it is the court's forms of administering remedies, your writs and what not. Enslaving and slaveholding have a very different process from all this, and allow us now with all deference to Messrs. Franklin and Armfield, Governor George McDuffie, the whilom "star of Carolina," Austin Woolfolk, and the whole pro-slavery fraternity in its infinite departments, to venture the doctrine, here within a summer day's ride of Canada,—that our republican slaveholding is contrary to the Constitution of these United States.

ON THE USE OF SLAVE PRODUCE.*

BY CHARLES STUART.

THIS question is here presented, not as *theoretical* or *scientific*, but as a *practical* one—not as relating to *other nations*, but to *ourselves*!

The articles embraced in this view, are, Sugar, Molasses and Rum—Cotton, Rice, Tobacco,—the Indigo which is raised in the slave states, the flour which we receive from slaves states, &c.

Why do we call these things, *slave produce*?

* Though not exactly agreeing with our valued correspondent in some of his conclusions, much less in the logic by which he arrives at them, we cheerfully acknowledge that he sheds light as well as heat on his subject; albeit, the former seems to us more refracted than the latter. We shall find room for a few paragraphs of comment at the close of the article, to which, and to the article at page 393 of the first volume, we would refer the reader as containing about all we have to say. There seems more need just now of exposing the sinfulness of slaveholding, than the innocence of buying some sorts of slave produce.—ED.

Because they are produced by *slave labor*—that is, by *forced* and *unrequited toil*: because from the *poor*, by whose labor they are obtained, their *bodies* are stolen—their *time* is stolen; their *wages* are stolen; their *liberty* is stolen; their *right to their wives and children*, is stolen; their right to cultivate their minds, and to worship God as they please, is stolen; their reputation is stolen; hope is stolen, and all virtuous motives are taken away, by a legalized system of most merciless and consummate iniquity. Such is the expense at which articles produced by slave labor, are obtained—they are always heavy with the groans, and often wet with the blood, of the guiltless and suffering poor.

It will be perceived, that by *slave produce*, articles, obtained, *viciously* by *free* and *hired labor*, are not meant. A merchant may impose upon you, in the quality, &c., of his goods; a farmer of *his produce*; a shoe-maker of *his leather*; a tailor, of *his work*; a lawyer may *flatter* or *betray* you—and a minister may *leave you at peace in your sins*—and all these are abominable things—but *they are not slave produce*! If you deal *fairly* with the merchant, and the farmer, and the shoe-maker, and the tailor, and the lawyer, and the minister, &c., their guilt is on their own heads; you do not compel it; you do not sustain others in compelling it; it is all their own. “You must needs go out of the world,” 1. Cor. v. 10, if you would avoid all commingling with *such* things. The occupations themselves, together with the articles which they supply, are lawful and right. But it is not so, with *slave-produce*. The business of holding slaves, is, in itself, eminently felonious; and sugar, molasses, rum, &c. &c., wrung by force out of the unrequited toil of the outraged poor, are stolen goods, obtained by the worst species of fraud. The occupation is the most criminal on earth; and the articles which it supplies, are, of all others the most loaded with robbery and wrong.

I affirm, that it is a transgression of the divine law, to purchase or consume such articles, *without a strict necessity*: and my reasons are the following.

Slaveholders *generally* hold slaves, in order to make money by their labor. Some, I know, hold slaves, especially *domestic slaves*, for purposes baser still; and some, I am willing to suppose, hold slaves temporarily, for better purposes; but *generally*, and so far only, my argument goes—

slaveholders hold slaves, in order to make money by their labor. For this purpose, the slaves are put to cultivate the cane, cotton, rice, tobacco, indigo, &c., and sugar, molasses, rum, cotton, rice, tobacco and indigo are brought by these nefarious means into the market.

Yonder then are the hogsheads of sugar and molasses; yonder are the puncheons of rum; yonder are the bales of cotton; and yonder, the rice and the tobacco and the indigo! Now suppose that *no one* would buy them, *because* obtained by robbery. Suppose that the cry of our brothers wrongs, going up to heaven against their oppressors were to turn our hearts within us; *we*, feeling for the down-trodden sufferers as we would wish *them* to feel for *us*, were our situations exchanged, what would become of the sugar molasses, rum, &c. &c.!! No one buys them. No one consumes them—not *because* they are not wanted; for *they are wanted*; but because the curse of the suffering and outraged poor is upon them; *there* they lie, mouldering, putrefying! Will the masters go on to raise another crop, by the same nefarious means; the former still mouldering and putrefying on their hands. Certainly not, if the principle stand firm against their tear-bedewed, their groan-burthened, their curse-commingled, their blood-polluted produce! and as certainly, all men wanting these things, and being eager to purchase them as soon as they can be honestly obtained, would not these same slaveholders, idolizing money and its accommodations as they do, procure these same things for us, by honest and manly means, as they may do, whenever they please, rather than ruin themselves, out of their love for fruitless tyranny? They indeed love tyranny, as all men love power, no doubt for its own sake—but they love it ten times as much for the sake of its golden fruit. Throw its golden fruit into the opposite scale, and the *fair rights of men*, instead of the *nefarious rights of tyrants*, would quickly become their choice.

What prevents this result?

It is not power, nor the love of power—for neither of these could be sustained in civilized society, without money! It is not exclusively the wickedness of the slaveholder, or of the slave trader, for as both of these are too lazy to work, and too proud to beg, they would soon perish with their putrid and unsaleable goods, unless they would so far relax their wickedness as to bring to us honestly-gotten, instead

of atrociously stolen goods! goods in obtaining which the laborer had been treated like a man, instead of being plundered of all that is most dear to man, of all that most powerfully conduces to make man, *man*!

But what is it that prevents the result above mentioned? What is it, which causes the slaveholder still to hug to his bosom, the nefarious system, and to rave like a goaded bull, whenever it is assailed?

It is simply and eminently the purchase and consumption of slave produce! The purchasers and consumers of slave produce, have slavery completely and despotically in their hands. They can crush it, lawfully, peaceably and effectually whenever they please, without a petition—without a remonstrance—without a lecture—without a paper a pamphlet or a pen, they can themselves abolish it. Let them refuse the purchase and consumption of its productions, and it is gone—and the slave converted into a free laborer, will pour into the market, in return for his wages duly received, the articles which they covet, into the employer's pocket, the money which he worships, then obtained by him by honest enterprise.

The whole matter is comprised in this. The slaveholder for some reason or other (and his reasons are various) wants money—and finds or thinks he finds his most convenient way to be, buying and driving to labor like beasts, his guiltless fellow men. The abolitionist, for some reason or other (and *his* reasons too, are various,) wants sugar, molasses, rum, cotton, tobacco, rice, &c., and finds that he can most conveniently supply himself by buying from the slaveholder, either directly or indirectly, the sugar, molasses, &c. &c., of which the slaveholder has become proprietor by the most deliberate, atrocious and complicated villainy. Both are satisfied—and both equally at the expense of the outraged and guiltless poor. The slaveholder is the *hireling*. The abolitionist, is the *hirer*. If there were no slaveholders (no hirelings of this description) there would be no slaves. And if there were no purchasers and consumers of slave produce, there would be no slaveholders. Human wants call for these articles. “I will supply you” cries free labor. “But I,” cries slave labor, “will more cheaply and conveniently supply you,” love and equity interfere, and exclaim, “yes, slave labor will supply you;” “but it will be at the expense of a system of iniquity, at

“which human nature shudders; which is essentially under the divine curse—and against which truth is lifting up her holy and trumpet voice.” “Yes, slave labor will supply you,” groans the slave, “but it will be at the expense of my tears and of my blood; it will be at the expense of blotting me as far as possible out of being as a man, and of consigning me to ignorance, pollution, disgrace, bondage, suffering and despair.” “Who will supply me most conveniently and cheaply,” cries human want. “I,” vociferates slave labor. “Then from *you* will I buy,” replies the other, “I indeed pity the slave, condemn the slaveholder, and abhor slavery; but sugar, &c., I want—and sugar I will have; and who don’t see that it would be a greater evil for me to pay two or three cents a pound more for it, than it is for the slave to suffer the loss of all things in being driven like a beast to procure it for me.”

But plain and solemn as these things undeniably are—and imperative as is the soul trying duty which they involve, still difficulties are made. I proceed to notice some of them from a person, whose general principles and conduct, I admire and love, as much as I detest and lament the opinions which he asserts on this subject. I mean the editor of the *Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine*, Vol. I, No. 4, page 393. “On abstinence from the products of slave labor.” I *cordially* yield him the credit of *sincerely intending right*—so, I should, as cordially, to many a slaveholder! but the *sincere* delusion of neither one nor the other, could sanction in my eyes, the pernicious principles or practices which they sustained.

“To help to a right decision,” says my friend, “we sometimes meet with an argument which may be comprised in the following syllogism. If slave-holding is a heinous crime in the sight of God, all participation in it, must be also criminal. But using the products of slave labor, is a participation in slaveholding. Therefore using the products of slave labor, must be criminal.” To the minor proposition of this syllogism, viz:—“that using the products of slave-labor, is a participation in slaveholding,” ing,” my friend demurs. Yet what can be a more self-evident fact? the fact the same, whether we do it, consciously or unconsciously. *Ignorantly* I may poison a man—*ignorantly* I may abet another in a thousand crimes; but *my*

ignorance, neither renders poison heathful, nor crime innocent, nor does it at all alter the *fact* of my participation. If my ignorance was *fairly excusable*, then am I innocent—this is a fundamental difference, in the *morality* of the act, if my ignorance was not fairly excusable, then am I guilty; the *participation* as a *matter of fact* being the same in both cases; but differing in its morality—in the one case being innocent, in the other, criminal! I fully agree with my friend that very little sugar or cotton, &c., is consumed with the *intention* of thereby maintaining the bondage of the slave—and whenever *excusable ignorance* exists of the fact, that such consumption does actually and powerfully maintain the bondage, I entirely believe that there is no crime. But I as decidedly, aver, that that consumption *does* maintain that bondage, and that it is criminal, whenever the fact might have been known. Nothing can be more undeniable, than that if the products of slave labor were not consumed, they would not be bought, if they were not bought, they would not be raised, if they were not raised, slaves would not be wanted—and if slaves were not wanted, there would be no slaves—but we should have the same articles, by honest enterprise, and by willing and requited labor, free from the tears and the blood of the innocent and outraged poor!

But, says my friend—"In order to show that our use of these or other products does actually have the effect, to aid and encourage the slaveholder to continue his sin, it must be shown that our abstinence will prevent, or at least tend to prevent his continuance. And this cannot be done, without showing a reasonable probability, that our abstinence will produce a sensible effect upon the market."

Surely my friend, when he penned the above, must have forgotten Mark xii. 41. 44. How much did the two mites of our blessed sister of old *tend* to the preservation of *the temple*? And what probability was there, that if she had kept her two mites in her own pocket, her parsimony, would have produced any sensible effect upon its magnificence? Her two mites were in value, about one cent. Estimate the temple and its revenue at \$500,000, and her share would be 1-50,000,000 (one fifty millionth part.) Her two mites then *tended* one fifty millionth part, towards the preservation of the temple; if she had withheld them, 1-50,000,000 part would have been withheld; but how difficult it would

have been to have shown to a carnal eye the *sensible* influence of such a lack upon the temple!! Yet God who saw the minuteness of her contribution towards the preservation of the temple, and how *insensible* the effect upon its magnificence would have been, if she had withheld it, pronounced it more than all the rich and mighty gave. The error of my brother here, I think, is, in looking at *the result as man sees it*, instead of looking at the principle, connected with its result, as God sees it,—viewed in the former light, nothing could appear more contemptible than the widow's mites—viewed in the latter, the gold and silver of the wealthy sunk into insignificance compared with them. The consumers of slave produce, as connected with slavery in these states, may be 50,000,000—supposing this estimate correct, each individual of these 50,000,000, has just about as much to do with slavery, as the widow had with the temple. By consuming slave produce, they as powerfully and as effectually sustain *slavery*, as the widow did the *temple*; and if the curse of supporting transgression be equivalent to the blessings of sustaining righteousness, as her blessing was great, how great will the curse be? The money given for slave produce, as undeniably and as directly goes to sustain slavery, as the widow's mites went to support the temple. The withholding of her mites, would not have destroyed the temple, would not have deranged one of its massy blocks; nay, would scarcely have been felt by a particle of dust on its walls. As little would the abstaining from slave produce by a single person affect slavery; but there is something antecedent to the *effect* produced upon slavery, which it would *infinitely affect*; that is, God's appreciation of the moral aspect of the action. *He* would see, that the individual, *did what he could in that particular*, to sustain the most ferocious and impure iniquity, and although the support yielded, was but the 50,000,000 part, yet has He not told us, that "whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, is guilty of all." James ii. 10.

But here my friend goes over to the *difficulties* of the case; he shows us, that slave *cotton* is mixed with almost every thing: that, industry and enterprise would be blighted; travelling arrested, clothing made extensively impracticable, printing and correspondence abolished, reformation crushed, and anti-slavery societies themselves put to a stop without it.

What a gang of lions ! Who does not startle at them ? Surely such *dreadful consequences* must abolish the divine injunctions. "Neither be partaker of other men's sins," 1. Tim. v. 22. "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil," Exodus xxiii. 2, and must render the divine warning, Psalm l. 18, of none effect.

But is it a fact, either in divine or human legislation, that *insuperable difficulties abolish law* ?

"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy, &c.," says God, Exodus xx. 8. Yet the same God declares to us, "that on the Sabbath days, the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are blameless," Matthew xii. 5.

So David and his followers, when they were famishing, entered into the temple, and did eat the shew bread, which it was ordinarily lawful for the priests *alone* to eat, Matthew xii. 4. And our blessed Lord and his apostles, in a similar strait, on a Sabbath day, plucked the ears of corn and allayed their hunger, Matthew xii. 1.

Was therefore the law of the Sabbath abolished ? By no means ! How then could these things be ? They *were* merely *exceptions to the law*, and exceptions do not abolish law, they on the contrary prove it, for if there were *no law*, there self-evidently could be no exceptions.

Here appears to me, to be the fundamental error of my friend. The din of the objections, shuts his ears to the demands of the law. The objections start up into giants before him, and the law vanishes from his sight. He deems the law abrogated, because the objections are great.

Undeniably, *slave cotton*, that is, cotton bedewed with the tears and heavy with the groans of the outraged and guiltless poor, is fearfully intermingled with a vast variety of our most necessary articles, and our dreadful alternative is to resign them, or to participate in sustaining slavery. What does duty require ?

I reply, clearly to resign them, *except* when they are, *properly speaking*, NECESSARY ! and *then* to use them, as David used the shew bread, the *actual necessity*, producing a *lawful exception*, without abrogating or weakening the law. When a man has no alternative but to starve, or to use slave bread—no alternative but to be naked, and to deprive himself of the mighty power of traveling, correspondence and the press, in vindicating the claims of God's law, and the rights of outraged humanity, or to use slave cotton,

the bread and the cotton must be used, but they must be used as *exceptions, attesting, not overturning* the law. The sin of *using them unnecessarily* remains the same; because in using them *unnecessarily*, the sin of slavery is *unnecessarily* sustained. David and his followers, together with the priests in the temple, would have sinned in doing as they did without the *necessity* which rendered them blameless in doing so. *That necessity did* render them blameless, but *that necessity* touched not the integrity of the law. The Sabbath remained God's day of rest as much as ever—and the shew-bread remained, as much as ever, the peculiar portion of the priests. So, *the necessity* for using slave cotton, where that necessity *does really exist*, while, *in such cases*, it renders the use of slave cotton blameless, touches not the integrity of the general prohibition. "Neither be partaker of other men's sins" remains a divine injunction, *a law for our guidance*, as much as if no exception to it had ever existed; and still it remains a crime as truly as ever, when we see a thief to consent with him.

But, exclaims my brother, "We say confidently, that a man *may buy* and use any product of slave labor, which is in itself proper to be used, without at all participating in the crime which attended the production."

But, I ask, where *is that product* of slave labor which *is, in itself, proper* to be used? *Bread*, let us remember, and *poisoned bread* are two different things—so are *sugar* and *slave sugar*; *cotton* and *slave cotton*; *rice* and *slave rice*, &c. Bread, in itself, is very proper to be used—so are sugar, cotton and rice—but bread *poisoned with arsenic*; and sugar, cotton and rice *poisoned with slavery*; with the guilt of the oppressor, and the tears and blood of the oppressed, are quite different things. *In themselves* they are always *most improper* to be used; and nothing but a strict necessity, such as that adverted to, can ever render their use blameless. This fundamental difference is, I think, generally lost sight of by my brother abolitionists: they think and speak of slave produce *as if* there were no *slavery* in it—*as if* slave sugar were, *sugar*—and slave rice, *rice*—and slave cotton, *cotton*. They might much better think and say, that a tallow candle was a spermaceti one; or poisoned bread, was *bread*. It is time for them to learn and remember, that *there is poison in it*; the *poison* of the masters' tyranny and

of the sufferings of the slave—that the cry of the down-trodden poor, has entered into the ears of Jehovah against it, James v. 4. *Physical poison* would make them start from *arsenicked* bread; shall not the *moral poison* which is in it, make them start more promptly still from *slave produce*? or have they hearts, capable indeed of caring for the life of their *own* bodies, but incapable, in this particular, of caring for the bodies and souls together of their outraged and suffering brethren whose sacred cause, in other things, they plead so boldly and so magnanimously? or do they think that by pleading the cause of the guiltless and suffering poor in words, they obtain a license to hire and sustain the oppression under which their poor clients are perishing?

My friend argues that slave produce is not *stolen goods*; and illustrates his argument by declaring that corn raised by means of a stolen horse is not *stolen corn*. But can *innocent men*, reduced by desperate oppression to *forced servitude*, be fairly thus compared to horses?

The horse, it is true, was stolen, but nothing was stolen *from* the horse; its services are always compulsory, and are *lawfully* compulsory when cruelty is not used in exacting them. The thief had no right to the horse; his sin consisted in *keeping it away from its lawful owner*; not in working it while he kept it away. The horse was stolen, but the corn which he raised by help of the horse was not stolen. The owner of the horse had a right to the horse, but not to the corn; the corn was the thief's lawful property. The owner of the horse indeed had a right to claim a remuneration for the loss of the horse's services, and the state was bound to bring the thief to justice as an example to others; but neither the owner of the horse, nor the state had any right to *the corn*—remuneration was due, but the *corn* was not due to the owner. The thief, when convicted, might pay the remuneration by any honest means he pleased without being under the least obligation to resign a single grain of the corn, except he was absolutely destitute of every other means of paying the just penalty of his transgression. The corn was his *legally*, although the horse was not his; and *morally*, the corn was his, although he owed repentance unto God for the theft, and remuneration to the owner for the loss of the horse's services.

But is it *so* when *a man* is stolen? Ah, no! In addi-

tion to the sin (as in the case of the horse,) of stealing the man from his owner—his owner who is God!—the guilt arises of stealing from the man his time, his wages and his labor—the freedom of his body and the freedom of his soul—the sacred security of conjugal union, and the right and the opportunity to bring up his own children according to his own heart's pleasure in the unfettered nurture and admonition of the Lord. The corn which his oppressor raises by means of his driven services, does not rightfully belong to his oppressor—it is stolen property of the worst kind. Not only (as in the case of the horse) is the slave stolen—stolen from God, his country, and himself! but the *products of his labor*, also, are stolen; stolen from *him* by the robbery which he is continually suffering of his time, his liberty and his unrequited services. The man who steals my money from me, is a thief; the man who steals my reputation from me, morally speaking, is a greater thief—he does me a far heavier injury—but *what kind of a thief is the man* who reduces me *by law, or under law*, to the state of a *beast*; who *obliterates* my manhood; who *enslaves me* without even the *imputation* of a crime; who not only robs me of money and reputation (or, of what is the same thing to a poor man, the means of acquiring money and reputation,) but who also robs me of my liberty, my time, my labor! who deprives me of house and home and country! and casts me forth, an outcast from mankind, an article of merchandise! a poor, forlorn, insulted slave! a beast whom *christians* and *republicans* buy and sell, without shame and without compunction! The corn, in this case, is stolen property of the worst kind; the slave has a *juster* claim to it than the master; the curse of his wrongs is upon it, and whosoever *unnecessarily* buys or consumes it, takes it heavy with that curse—he buys it from the *hyper-thief*, the thing itself being a stolen thing in the most aggravated sense, and in doing so, he sustains, as far as he can, in that particular, the curse of the hyper-plunderer against the helpless and innocent sufferer of the most enormous outrage.

My brother, in the ardor of his argument, falls into another delusion similar to the above, and in illustrating his idea says, that a man does not act “inconsistently with his doctrine, when he condemns the dishonesty of the miller, “and yet carries corn to his mill,” as if this case were simi-

lar to that of condemning the dishonesty of the slaveholder, and yet purchasing and consuming his nefariously gotten goods. But are the cases similar?

The miller's business is a lawful business. The slaveholder's business, however legalized by wickedness for a time, is always eminently unlawful! The miller works for you himself, or pays a fair equivalent for the work which he gets performed for you. The slaveholder in order to supply *you*, is guilty of the most atrocious robbery: he gets sugar for you at the expense of bereaving your guiltless brother of all that is most dear to man! and he does not do this incidentally: but *fundamentally*, as an inherent and essential part of his system, so that remaining a slaveholder he can no more supply you, without thus horribly robbing your brother, than he could live without breathing; this atrocious felony committed against his down-trodden brother, being as inseparable from *forced servitude*, as breath is from life. In rebuking the miller for his dishonesty, you obey the divine commandment, Lev. xix. 17. In continuing to deal with the miller, (I mean in any *ordinary* case, such as I doubt not my friend intended,) you suit your own *lawful* convenience: "You cannot disentangle yourself from connexions of this kind without going out of the world," 1 Cor. v. 10. But were the miller a *thief*, and you knew it! whenever you took your grist to his mill, were he to go out amongst his neighbors, and, with the lash suspended over them, were he, *to your knowledge*, to drive them like beasts to grind your grain, and then to dismiss them without wages, merely giving them some pittance in order to preserve their strength for another similar occasion, could you *then*, as a kind and honest man, send your grist to him, or purchase *his* grist thus obtained by violence and fraud, or if you did do so, would you not plainly be a partaker in his sin: a tempter and a sustainer of his iniquity?

But to me the most grievous part of my brother's argument is, his representation of *abstinence from slave produce*, as a *physical* expedient; and when he inveighs against it as a physical expedient arresting moral evil. What does he mean by a physical expedient in an objectionable sense? Does he mean that when I know a tradesman to be an idler or a drunkard, or a lawyer a villain, or a professor of religion a hypocrite and a cheat, and therefore refuse

to employ them, that I am guilty of an objectionable physical expedient? or that regard for God's law and for human virtue and happiness, does not prohibit my giving them countenance in their iniquity? Does he mean, that when I know intoxicating drinks to be the direct and dreadful source of such a vast accumulation of vice and misery as is pouring over the land, my refusing to buy or use the liquid poison, is an objectionable physical expedient? or that holy love does not require me neither to touch, or taste, or handle the polluting and accursed thing? Yet if he do not mean such things as these, how can he fancy that refraining from slave produce is an objectionable physical expedient? I will not deal with an idle and drunken mechanic; I will not deal with a treacherous lawyer; I will not support a religious professor who is a hypocrite and a cheat; and my brother, I suppose, approves of my prudence and my benevolence. But do I do a more grievous wrong to the law of God or to human virtue and happiness, by countenancing a drunken mechanic, or a roguish lawyer, or a professor of religion who is a hypocrite and a cheat, than I do by countenancing a slaveholder? or, *which* is the most destructive character in society; and which does holy love most loudly call upon us to discountenance, the poor, idle, drunken laborer? or the treacherous lawyer? or the hypocritical professor? or the deliberate and unbending plunderer under a system of complicated mischief framed by law, of all that is dear on earth to his guiltless brother? And if because intoxicating liquors are pouring vice and misery over the land, I rightfully and benevolently refuse to deal in them, with their makers and venders, and users—why should it be an objectionable physical expedient for me to refuse to deal in slave produce, with its perpetrators or venders, or users, because it sustains a system of vice and misery more deep and deadly than even that which flows from intoxicating drinks? Intoxicating liquors are *physically* poisonous, and therefore should not be used; slave produce is replete with *moral* poison, should *it* be used? or, am I bound to be more careful of my body than of my soul? or, of the virtue and safety of *the freeman*, who, *in this country*, is always more or less able, if willing, to take care of himself, than of the guiltless and writhing *slave*, who is *dumb*? whose soul is scathed, and whose mouth is sealed by desperate oppression? or is

drunkenness a greater enemy to God and man, than tyranny? Which are doing most evil to this nation, drunkards or slave masters? which yield the most mighty and horrible power? which produce most mobs? which practice most *lynching*? which threaten the Union most? which are the proudest, the most irascible, imprudent, factious, rebellious, untameable, cruel, impure and unjust? Are they not mates, alike immense, misshapen, destructive and portentous! and can we then rightfully and benevolently encourage and sustain one, while we are doing, and are bound by duty to do, all that we can to bring the other to repentance? Can we lawfully take from drunkenness its meat and drink, yet nurture slavery with the choice food on which it revels and destroys? Take away intoxicating liquors, and drunkenness is gone! Take away slave produce, and slavery is extirpated! Shall we call it a righteously moral means to refrain from the aliment of drunkenness, and an objectionably physical expedient, to refrain from the aliment of slavery? Shall we deem it *love*, to *starve* the one and to nourish the other? Can we with righteous consistency come over at the cry of his misery to the help of the drunkard, yet turn a deaf ear to the wail of the slave?

"Ah," said a young slave in Jamacia, a few years ago within the hearing of one my of acquaintances, as with his fellow slaves, he was rolling a hogshead of sugar to the shore, "if the people in England knew how much of our blood, and how brutally, has been shed to make the sugar in this hogshead, there is not a kind heart amongst them that would ever taste a grain of it." A friend of mine returned from the same island about three years ago. I visited him just before I last left England. "A short time before I started," he said to me—"I was conversing with a very intelligent slave on a sugar plantation and asked him, if it was really true that they suffered as much as was reported. I found it difficult to persuade him that I was in earnest, but when at length satisfied that my question was serious, he exclaimed with every gesture of surprise and pain. "They masse, dem not know, dat kill me?" In other words. What sin! don't every body know that it kills us? Many years have not elapsed, since the *moral expedient* of starving out drunkenness, by abstaining from the food on which its existence is dependant, appeared as chimerical, as now appears

the *equally moral expedient* of starving out slavery by abstaining from the food, by which alone it lives. But should this last expedient, *notwithstanding its sound and sacred morality*, prove at last chimerical, what will be *the reason*? Will it be *want of power* in the consumers of slave produce thus to extirpate slavery? Certainly not, for no proposition in mathematics is more plain or more undeniable, than that they have the *absolute power*, whenever they please to extirpate it. All that is wanting, is the *will*, and if the will be wanting, *whose fault is it*? Is it not the fault of *every individual* who does not do *his share*, *without waiting for any body*? Is it not yours, and yours, and mine, brother, who look more to *human concurrence*, than to the *divine law*? Who *will not do our part*, which we *can do whenever we please*, because we cannot get others to do their parts? But if so we live, and if so we die, will not our brothers' blood be found in our skirts?

My dear brother is unwilling that the *Anti-Slavery Society* should also become an *anti-slave produce society*. So am I—but on grounds different from his. I am unwilling on the same grounds, on which I am unwilling, that the *Sunday School Society*, or the *Temperance Society*, &c. &c., should become also, an *Anti-Slavery Society*. Those societies *sin*, I think grievously by rejecting Anti-Slavery facts and Anti-Slavery principles, so much as they do, from their measures and their publications—in this respect, they are guilty I think, of a base and criminal subserviency to public wickedness. Noble and lovely, and beloved as they are, yet better in my opinion were it, that they should cease to be, than that they should thus compromise God's law and their outraged brother's cause. But yet, I would by no means have them become anti-slavery societies. Their appropriate cause is already marked out, and it is a glorious one. They have enough to do, each in its own department. No important work can be accomplished efficiently, without a wise division of labor. The little pin is made and afforded so abundantly and so beneficially, by twenty different and distinct trades, working separately and appropriately at it. The body wants toes and feet, as well as fingers and hands and head and heart. So the glorious work of love through Christ flourishes, by the various associations, which conduct its different parts. Bible societies, must not become Sunday

school societies—nor Sunday school societies, temperance societies—nor temperance societies, anti-slavery societies—nor anti-slavery societies, anti-slave produce societies, any more than feet must become fingers, or fingers, brains.—Hands and feet and eyes and ears are bound indeed to serve one another; and so are benevolent societies, and they sin when they do not—but still they must not be confounded—each must retain its own distinctive character. The Bible Society is bound to sustain the Temperance Society; and the anti-slavery society, is bound to urge and sustain abstinence from slave produce. But each of these departments, in order to be conducted beneficially, needs a distinct and appropriate organization—and they can no more be *rightfully* confounded together, than they can *rightfully* stand aloof from one another, whatever be the motive, or whatever the influence when they do stand aloof from one another, they are recreants in *that particular*, from the common cause. They prefer their *own parts* to the whole. They seek partial, not universal righteousness, they are Sectarian, not Christian.

One other position of my brother, I feel bound to combat. He says, “suppose the whole world,” (one twentieth part of it would suffice,) “should abstain from these products, and the slave states should thereby be compelled formally to abolish slavery. So far as the abolition was produced by these means, it would rest on no principle but necessity, it would be a slavish act. The sin would be unrepented of, and the chance is, that the reformation would be rather nominal than real. For there could not be, in the southern states, as in the West Indies, hosts of special justices, to watch the unwilling benefactors, and secure the rights of the weaker party.”

But does my dear brother mean, that the rescue of sufferers from suffering, is not desirable, unless the *inflictors of suffering* repent? Would he leave his neighbor's house to burn, until he could prevail upon the incendiaries to be heartily sorry? Would he leave *slaves* perishing, until *slaveholders* are brought to repentance? If, in traversing the ocean, he should be cast away on the shores of Morocco, and reduced to slavery there, would he reject the rescue, and a restoration to his native country, until his Arab master, could be convicted of sin and brought to Christ?—Would he reply, “no! my master's releasing me under these

circumstances would be a *slavish* act, and I will remain a slave, until he releases me *holily*? Or does he forget, that on the supposition which he makes, the emancipation would be quite *voluntary* on the master's part, and enacted strictly by himself, out of regard to his own interests; however much he might despair or abhor the *fanaticism* which urged him to it? By my dear brother's supposition, *all* the consumers of slave produce refrain from it, *because* it is *slave produce*, not because they do not want sugar and molasses and cotton and rice, &c., for they do love these things, and want them greatly—but *because* they love their God, and their brother more! *because* they will deny themselves these desirable articles, rather than participate in the slaveholder's guilt, or aid in the misery and degradation of the guiltless slave!—Does he not perceive, that as soon as the slaveholders were satisfied that they could never sell another pound of sugar, &c., wrung by force and fraud out of the outraged slave, but that they would be surè of an abundant market for the same things *fairly obtained* by hired and voluntary labor, they would be as eager for *immediate and thorough emancipation, at home*, under law, as the abolitionists now are, and that in this awakened and dominant sense of *their own interest*, benevolence would have a better security for the new liberty on these principles bestowed, than all the *special* justices in the world could yield? We have a striking instance of this in Antigua. I know of no ground whatever for believing that the former slaveholders of that island have repented of their sin. It was *policy*, not righteousness, *interest*, not benevolence, which prompted them somewhat upwards of two years ago, to the *immediate and thorough* emancipation of their slaves on the spot, it was, in my dear brother's sense, a *slavish act*, and I have no doubt, that in God's sight it was so. Yet it was a *perfectly voluntary act*, properly speaking, *their own act*, in view of exactly the same influences, as all the world's abstaining from slave produce, would exercise universally upon slaveholders; and the same sense of interest which prompted them to the act has been found ten thousand times more efficient than any *extraneous superintendence*, could possibly have been, in securing the rights of the weaker party, the fact is, that in such cases, the power which rules, is not physical, as my brother supposes it, but is moral, exercising its might not

upon the body, but upon the mind—not by physical penalties, but by moral persuasion—not by force, but by motives, the person thus governed, yielding not by compulsion, but by choice, the choice of good instead of evil, of right instead of wrong, of liberty instead of slavery, of honesty instead of theft, of justice and kindness instead of violence and fraud, of interest in some measure wholesome, instead of their tyranny and pride.

I remark in conclusion, that *truth* is eternally the same. That it is not strengthened by human attestation, nor enfeebled by human denial. Slavery is *high treason* against God and against human virtue and happiness, whatever slaveholders or their apologists may think or say ; and alike whether the slave is kindly or cruelly treated ; alike in *fact*, though differing in *amount* : and it is equally, and *as obviously* true, that *the use of slave produce*, sustains slavery more directly and powerfully than does any other thing, *guiltily* if the use be not strictly and fairly speaking *necessary*, *blamelessly*, if strictly and fairly speaking it be *indispensable*. The Anti-Slavery Society and any other society, my dear and honored brother, the editor of A. S. Quarterly, or any other person friend or foe, may deny this, if they please, or admitting it, may refuse to advocate the conduct which it requires. But the *truth* remains the same, unchanged by their assent or denial ; and by God's unchangeable truth, must every man stand or fall. *Every moment* that slavery continues, God's law is outraged, and the most dear and sacred of human rights, are trampled in the dust. *Every atom* of slave produce which is used, actually and directly sustains slavery as far as it goes, for slavery could no more exist without the consumption of its products, than life could be preserved without food ; the consumption of these products being *criminal* where *unnecessary*—*blameless* where *indispensable* ; and every individual who uses slave produce, does all that he can in that particular to support slavery. He is not the *fifty million*, and what the fifty million can do therefore, he is not required to do—but he is the *one*, and what *one* can do, *is required* of him ! If he unnecessarily sustain slavery, he is partaker in the guilt of tyrants. If he do it *necessarily* the *necessity* pleads his excuse. God who makes the law, sees and recognizes the exception. No precept of scripture is more absolute than that against

theft. Yet the thief is excused, when hunger compels him. "Men do not despise a thief, if he steals to satisfy his soul when he is hungry," Prov. vi. 30. So the abolitionist who resides where he cannot sustain life without using slave produce, is excusable in using slave produce, as far as it is really necessary for his life and health. A compensation indeed may be required of him. "But if he be found, he shall restore seven fold, he shall give all the substance of his house," Prov. vi. 31. This compensation, the abolitionist richly pays, when being unable to travel, or speak, or correspond efficiently against slavery, without the use of slave cotton, he buys and employs it, for the extirpation of slavery. This is one of the ways in which God takes, "the wise" (the worldly wise) "in their own craftiness," 1. Cor. iii. 19. The slaveholder raises cotton for the support of slavery. The abolitionist buys the cotton and pulls slavery down. The starving man, *compelled by hunger* uses *food without blame*, which would *otherwise* be unlawful. The abolitionist *compelled* by an impulse mightier far, even by *love*, "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," seeing his guiltless brother in bondage, and realizing what he would justly wish, were situations altered, uses for his *brother's* deliverance, what he could not use without guilt for his *own* convenience. Just as the Temperance Society man will not hesitate to give alcohol to his neighbor, if alcohol be really necessary for his neighbor's life or health, but *without that necessity*, would rather lose his right hand, than put alcohol within his neighbors reach.

We may observe, that the whole *apparent* difficulty of this solemn question, relates to *cotton*. The other articles of slave labor, in our market, sugar, molasses, rum, tobacco, rice, indigo, &c., are clearly *unnecessary*, and therefore *never* can be *lawful*, except in *strictly medical cases*. Besides, with very little trouble perhaps, and a small additional expense, sugar, molasses, and indigo *produced by free labor* can always be obtained. Rum and tobacco, should never be used except as medicines, and rice can be dispensed with till it can be gotten undefiled by the pollution of tyranny—unmoistened by the tears and unbedewed with the blood of the guiltless and down trodden poor. Situated as we are, and with the whole world, excepting *a few ultra abolitionists* to sustain us, it is very easy now to make light of these

eternal truths. But will it be as easy to give a *satisfactory answer* to God, when He shall make inquisition for our brothers' blood, and require to know, why we aided in shedding it? Consumers of slave produce, look well to it.

My dear brother's principle, "of doing to others, as we would have them do to us, of remembering them that are in bonds, as bound with them," is dear to my whole heart, but with my whole heart, I reject *the preservation of my influence*, as the rule of this principle. The clear and thrilling claims of my God's law, and of my perishing brother's rights and blood, are *my rule*; and when the *preservation of my influence*, comes up against this rule, or *as a substitute for it*, I cast it from me, as I should cast from me a venomous serpent that would otherwise sting me to death.

God demands that every man should do his duty, *his own duty*, without waiting for any body, and without depending upon any body. What *ought* to be done, *can* be done.—Nothing but *a corrupt will* prevents it. And amidst all the *eulogia* which have crowned with praise the glorious spirits that have adorned the world, all others sink into insignificance compared with Mark xiv. 8, "she hath done, what she could."

C. STUART.

Whitesboro', Nov. 14th, 1835.

Our correspondent affirms that buying slave produce is a violation of the divine law. His chapter and verse for the *why* and *wherefore* are developed on the 155th page, and amount to this. If no body would buy the products, slaveholders would abandon their wicked system. Hence, we are bound to abstain as a *means* of bringing slavery to an end—as furnishing a grand and irresistible argument *ad crumenam*. Now, granting for the arguments' sake, and that only, that it would be irresistible, *if* all non-slaveholders would unite, does it certainly follow that we ought to prefer *this* means to every other? Slavery would cease as soon, *if* all non-slaveholders would unite in a purely moral rebuke of it—*if*, denouncing it as piracy, they would withdraw from it the props of their 'compacts' and 'compromises' and mealy-mouthed engagements to restore fugitives. The divine law surely binds me to extinguish, if I can, the fire

that threatens to devour my neighbor's house, but it does not bind me to do it by stopping off the supporter of combustion with blankets, when I think I can better gain the end by throwing on water.

But if there is no probability of enough uniting in abstinence sensibly to affect the market, or rather to make slaveholding a losing business, the argument *ad crumenam* is with things unborn—it is less than nothing and vanity.

Our correspondent refers to the widow, who for giving two mites received the divine commendation. Did that commendation apply to her *object*, or to her *motives*? Now the question is not about the *motives* of the abstinent from slave produce, but about the *obligation* to abstain. It is quite possible that the Lord might have commended the widow's act, while he considered giving for the support of the temple of no moral obligation. He was looking, not at the *support* of the temple, but at the *motives* of the supporters. We are looking at the overthrow of slavery, and not at the motives of any body. And we apprehend our friend's argument goes legitimately to commend the *motives* of those who abstain from its products, with a sincere intention, however inefficient the means, to overthrow slavery, and to condemn the *motives* of him who buys even an ounce of cotton, consenting to the robbery by which it was raised; but no further. Now, our correspondent, if we understand him, holds that the buyer of an ounce of cotton does, to a certain fraction, be his *motives* what they may, either ignorantly or knowingly *support slavery*. We say, no—not necessarily, any more than we support the odious, and dishonest bank monopolies whose notes we pass while we are using all our power as a free citizen to put them down. He does not necessarily, for our correspondent has failed to show that his abstinence would be either *the* means or *a* means of abolishing slavery. But does not the buyer furnish to the slaveholder both the motive to tyrannize and the means of surrounding himself with the instruments and safe-guards of tyranny? Yes, but both the cotton and the money are *bona in se* and fit objects of barter, and the buyer of the cotton is no more responsible for the use which the other shall make of the money, than the buyer of the money is responsible for the use the other shall make of the cotton. It may be said that the common law holds the buyer of stolen goods

to be *particeps criminis* to the theft. Granting that slave products are stolen goods, which we have not much disposition to deny, the question is not one of legal technics but of morality. The buyer is certainly *particeps* if his motive be thievish—if he consents to the theft or silently enjoys its profits. But let us put a case sufficiently near the parallel for the purpose of illustration. A man offers to sell me wheat which I know to have been stolen from one who keeps it for sale. Suppose there is no law or public sentiment by which I can compel him to restore, or bring him to justice, and suppose my refusing to buy will not in any considerable degree spoil his market. Here is a case substantially like the slaveholder's. Were I to buy the wheat silently I should be a *particeps*. But I say to the seller, You stole this wheat, and were I to take it without paying a cent, I should serve you no worse than you served the owner. But as I know the owner wants the money, and I want the wheat, I pay you a fair price for it—go and hand the money to the owner, and know that if there is an honest man above ground he shall hear of the transaction. Am I a *particeps*? I spend more to bring the thief to justice than the profits on the bargain. Am I to be considered a *particeps*? There is a point somewhere at which I stop being responsible for other men's wickedness. If non-intercourse were the appropriate cure of common avarice, overreaching and dishonesty, we should be bound to use it with many of our neighbors, but our correspondent himself confesses that it is not, and it is difficult to see how the mere enormity of slavery excepts it from the same rule.

From these considerations we think that our correspondent in showing that the purchase or consumption of slave produce is "a transgression of the divine law," has been obliged to rely solely on his reason, and his reason has failed him. Still, though we differ from him altogether as to the *reason* for abstinence, we do not probably differ much as to the *practice*. He admits in his exception of "necessity" as much license in the purchase and use as our rule would allow.—The difference is this. We hold the purchase or use of any slave *products* to be no wrong in itself, but perfectly right unless it appears that abstinence would so much benefit the slave as to be required by the *divine rule* of doing to others as we would be done by. And we do regard every

sacrifice of these things which can be made without materially impairing our usefulness, of which conscience must judge, to be a duty we owe to the slave, *simply as a testimony of our sympathy with his sufferings and remembrance of his wrongs*. This rule will certainly exclude slave sugar and molasses, to say nothing of rum and tobacco which ought to be *tabu* as *mala in se*. And it will give a decided preference for linen and free labor cotton over fabrics which are partly, though in very small part, the products of slave labor.

Our correspondent thinks the purchase or use of any products of slave labor to be *SIN*, *except* where a "*strict necessity*" requires the use. This rule, after all, gives as much play to the conscience as ours. What is a *strict, actual necessity*? It would seem from our correspondent's own interpretation that it includes much more than merely saving life—some degree of usefulness and comfort must be saved. And how is conscience to decide the *how much* any more surely under his rule than ours? We leave the candid reader to judge.

Slaveholding is a *malum in se*, which no circumstances or consequences can convert into a *bonum*. The use of some of the products of slave labor is a *bonum in se*, which may and often does become a *malum, per consequentia*.

THE EDITOR.

CASTE IN THE UNITED STATES: A REVIEW.

BY THE EDITOR.

MARIE ou L' ESCLAVAGE aux ETATS-UNIS, *Tableau de mœurs Américaines*; par GUSTAVE DE BEAUMONT, l' un des auteurs de l' ouvrage intitulé; Du Système Pénitentiaire aux Etats-Unis. Bruxelles, 1835.

[MARIA or SLAVERY in the UNITED STATES, a *Picture of American manners*; by GUSTAVUS DE BEAUMONT, one of the authors of the work entitled: Of the Penitentiary system of the United States. 2 vols. 12 mo.]

IN our country religious tyranny and toleration are equally unknown. All sects are quite at home here. None have a monopoly of power. None live by sufferance. Hence a

common feeling of patriotism is to be found in all. Indeed, we may say, the more singular and extravagant a man's creed, the more does he love the country which protects him in the full enjoyment of it. We think it will be found on examination that none are more devotedly attached to American institutions than the members of the weaker sects, or indeed, than the insulated and unbelieving dissidents from all sects. Now we presume that any scholar who has mastered the A B C of American politics will say that our country owes much of her quietness and safety to her not respecting creeds, to her looking at what a man does and not at what he believes, to her not having a favorite church. Here are men whose *doxies* are at everlasting war, and yet the men themselves live together in tolerable peace under the same government—simply because, with their *doxies* the government has nothing to do. And our scholar need be little more profound to discover that the whole charm would be broken by putting any one sect, however small, under the ban of the government, or what would amount to the same, under the trampling feet of popular proscription. The moment the governing power begins to measure men's rights by their creeds, liberty of conscience is overboard with a millstone around her neck.

Here a practical inquiry meets us. How comes it that a government which never cares for the color of a man's creed should take him to do for the color of his — coat? Is it that a man's religious belief has less to do with the well being of society than the tint of his broadcloth? Lest the governing power should excuse itself by saying that belief is involuntary, while the color of a coat may be changed at pleasure, we will just suppose that in spite of drapers and tailors a man's vestments, by a sort of anti-chameleon property, are infallibly assimilated to a certain dingy hue, which is fated to stick to him as tight as the skin in which he was born. Where would be the righteousness or the good policy of teasing and worrying this individual to dress in orthodox blue, when it is out of his power to wear any thing but brown, be his desires what they may? Now the folly and wickedness of such tyranny, bating that our supposition should have been carried a little deeper, to wit,—*skin-deep*, is precisely that of which the governing power in our republic is deeply guilty. It would be thought downright injustice to

make a man ineligible to office for want of belief in the trinity, and monstrous bigotry, to exclude one from a table, or a pew, or a coach, or a steamboat-cabin for a belief in transubstantiation. Such crimes are unheard of. Yet it is thought no injustice nor bigotry, but a very just and proper and politic thing to proscribe a man for wearing the skin which his Maker gave him. It would be thought a very barbarous thing for men of learning and talent to stigmatize and condemn all people of slender intellect, and a very impolitic thing for the rich to make enemies of the poor, and a very unpatriotic thing for any body to increase the temptations of the vicious; but so common, nay, universal a thing is it to stigmatize and maltreat persons of a certain color, or rather who are NOT of a certain color, that some who in their hearts abhor it, feel compelled, as they love their daily bread, to do it, and those who, following their hearts, refuse to follow custom, are thought to injure, by their *ultraism*, the very cause they love. Yes, let a *white* man invite a *colored* one to sit with him in his pew or in his parlor, and he can hardly expect to be able afterwards either to rent or purchase a pew or a house without being called upon to pledge himself never to repeat the act. If he had declared open war upon decency and spurned from his house the very mother that bore him, the white public would not shrink from him with more pious horror, than they now profess to feel. Pray, what is the matter? we ask of a generous and enlightened public. The reply is couched with quaking apprehension, in the appalling interrogatory; *would you have your daughter marry a negro?* And the utter slavery to which this tyrant prejudice has reduced every thing that is noble and good in the land, is evinced by nothing more clearly than by the pains taking of even abolitionists to show that colored men *may be* enfranchised and elevated without bringing on the dreaded consequence. Not a word to vindicate your daughter's sacred right to the disposal of her own affections! Not a word for the equally sacred right of the colored brother to win affection where he can! But a tacit, crouching, slavish assent to the terribleness of the bug-bear.

From such slavery, we humbly pray, good Lord deliver us.

Call submission to it policy or what you will, it is too much in the line with the driving of the tyrant we oppose

for us to have any complacency in it. We must fling off the last fetter before we can breathe freely. We have a mind to let the public know that they may as well attempt to scare us from common civility to the professors of a different creed by asking—*would you have your daughter marry a heretic?*—as to choke our friendship for the deserving colored man, by the other question. If the immaculate advocates of *pure blood* deem this a punishable heresy, let them come upon us where we sit, with tar—apt emblem of their own virtue—and feathers of the goose, and work their will, but we beg of them not to commit any more of those dastardly assaults upon the innocent colored people.

Being sure that this caste of color, skulking among our free institutions like the devil in paradise, is the natural offspring and prime minister of slavery, and lives nowhere apart from its parent abomination, we were not at all surprised at the book which we have placed at the head of this article. A refined Frenchman, who had never learned to curl the lip at his Maker's taste in tinging some of His roses and violets of a darker hue than the rest, could hardly resist the temptation to entertain the Parisians with the incidents to which the courtship and marriage of a colored damsel by a white gentleman would lead in the United States. The object of M. de Beaumont is to paint the manners of our people, especially as they stand related to slavery.

We will glance at the tale on which he has seen fit to build his remarks, premising that he was associated with M. de Tocqueville, as a deputation from the French government to examine our penitentiary system, after despatching which jointly, in a luminous report, M. de Tocqueville has taken up in scientific style our democratic institutions, while M. de Beaumont has served up our manners. Here is the story. A Frenchman, disgusted with his country, where his political predilections were on the popular side, while his family connections were with the aristocracy, betakes himself to America. From New-York he follows the current of emigration up the majestic Hudson, traverses the grand canal and the lakes till he finds himself in Michigan on the borders of the Saginaw. On this outmost wave of civilization the traveller discovers among the rare indications of human labor which begin to disturb the primitive wilderness, a remarkable structure, a cottage, whose elegance of form is

strongly contrasted with the rudeness of its materials. A beautiful lakelet whose flowery margin hides the light canoe, is spread before it, and nature on either side owns the taste and skill of the possessor. But who the possessor can be, the nearer the stranger approaches the more does he marvel. A solitary man is at length discovered,—a brother Frenchman, who hospitably entertains the new-comer, not in the mysterious cottage, but in a simpler cabin near it.—This man of the wilderness is named Ludovic, and the curiosity of the traveler elicits from him the sad tale which illustrates American manners,—a tale which greatly allays his admiration for America and sends him back to the country from which he came, never to quit it.

Ludovic's ambition had made him the football of fortune in his own country till he was tired of life. America was his resort. He was received by Daniel Nelson a distinguished citizen of Baltimore, who was under obligations for certain favors received from Ludovic's family. This Daniel Nelson was one of the cool-headed, sharp-sighted sons of New England, who had commenced making a fortune in New Orleans, but for reasons disclosed in the sequel had retired to spend his days in quiet seclusion in Baltimore.—He had a lofty national pride; was a hater of the English; an ardent Presbyterian, of which sect he had become a preacher; a distinguished promoter of Temperance, Bible, Missionary, and Colonization Societies,—and though not a slaveholder was a believer in the invincibility of prejudice against the people of color. His family consisted of two motherless children,—George and Maria of the ages of twenty and eighteen, respectively as brave and as beautiful as the necessities of novel-writing require her brother and the *heroine* to be. It is needless to say, and to say whereabout, the tender passion was in due time hatched. It grew vigorously, and, if we are to credit the author, the food it fed on was quite ambrosial. The crisis of its full revelation to the damsel *revealed a mystery* to the lover. Indeed the enigmatical foretokenings of this had made part of the aliment of love. Maria was not only as interesting in herself as such a character should be, but there was something as interesting as it was unaccountable in her ways. She saw no company; with all the accomplishments of the world, she was out of the world. Her amusements were not in the

ball room nor the theatre, but in the Alms House. With angelic innocence she shrunk from observation like a criminal. With more social affections than her heart could hold, she lived a recluse. When the Frenchman told his love, "a ray of joy sparkled in her fine eye, but a cloud of sadness veiled it the next moment." What was the matter?

The mystery which it cost the enamored Frenchman, long time and pains and well nigh despair to penetrate, we will despatch with a word. Maria was *colored*! Not *chromatically*, reader, but *genealogically*. Nelson had married in New Orleans a young creole, not less distinguished for her beauty than for her modesty and piety, named Theresa Spencer. George and Maria were the blessing on this union. But among the discarded suitors of Theresa's youth, was Fernando d'Almanza whose disappointment suffered his revenge only to sleep. In process of time it awaked for mischief. D'Almanza possessed a secret more terrible in America than a thunderbolt. He divulged and proved that Theresa's *great-grandmother was a mulatto*! The *une goutte de sang noir* sunk into the family peace like the leaden bullet of the hunter. The *eclatante blancheur*, like the lily, of Theresa's complexion was no charm against the destroyer. She withered under the public scorn and died of a broken heart. Nelson forsook New Orleans and found for a while a refuge for his motherless babes in Baltimore. They profited by the ignorance of their new acquaintances, and only "felt the trouble *in their souls*."

This revelation was far from being a death-blow to the passion of the generous Ludovic. He heard it from the lips of Nelson himself in reply to his request for the hand of Maria, and it gave increased importunity to his suit. Nelson foresaw the *perils* of the match, and with his characteristic prudence and firmness dissuaded the applicant.— "When he saw our emotions a little calmed, he said to me:— "Enthusiasm misleads you, my friend; beware of yielding "to a generous passion. Alas! if you look with an unprejudiced eye at the sad reality, the sight will be more than "you can sustain, and you will perceive that it is impossible "for a white to be united to a woman of color."

"I cannot describe to you," continues Ludovic, "the "trouble which these words threw into my soul. What a "strange situation! at the moment when Nelson spoke

“them, I saw near me Maria, whose complexion surpassed in whiteness the swans of the great lakes.”

The Frenchman uttered in no measured terms his indignation against prejudices so much at war with our national professions, and Nelson entered into a labored explanation of the origin and nature of these prejudices, tracing them to the fountain-head of slavery. After having discussed the treatment of the slaves, the dialogue of Nelson and Ludovic proceeds as follows :—

“LUDOVIC. But whence comes it that you brand with so much disgrace, those to whom you have given liberty ?

“NELSON. The black who is no longer a slave *was* one, and, if he was born free, it is known that his father was not.

“LUDOVIC. I understand the reprobation which befalls the negro and the mulatto even after their enfranchisement, for their color refers incessantly to their servitude ; but what I do not comprehend is, that the same brand should attach to the people of color who have become *white*, and whose whole crime is to count a black or mulatto among their ancestors.

“NELSON. This rigor of public opinion is doubtless unjust ; but it appertains to the very dignity of the American people. Placed before two races different from his own, the Indians and the Negroes, the American has mingled himself with neither. He has kept pure the blood of his fathers. To prevent all contact with those nations, he has branded them in public opinion. The brand rests upon the race, when the color no longer exists.

“LUDOVIC. In the present state of your customs and your laws, you do not recognize an hereditary nobility ?

“NELSON. Certainly not. Reason rejects all distinction accorded to birth and not to personal merit.

“LUDOVIC. If your manners do not admit the transmission of honors by blood, wherefore do they sanction the entail of infamy ? A man is not born noble, but he is born infamous ! This is, to speak the truth, an odious prejudice. But still, a white could, if such were his choice, marry a free woman of color ?

“NELSON. No my friend you deceive yourself.

“LUDOVIC. What power would prevent him ?

“NELSON. The law. It contains an express prohibition, and declares such a marriage void.

"LUDOVIC. What an odious law! Such a law I shall
"brave.

"NELSON. There is an obstacle graver than the law, it
"is custom. You are ignorant of the condition of colored
"females in American society.

"Understand (I blush for the shame of my country) that
"in Louisiana the highest condition of free colored females
"is that of prostitution to the whites.

"New Orleans is peopled in a great part by Americans
"from the North, who come to enrich themselves, and go
"when their fortunes are made. It is rare that these tran-
"sient inhabitants marry, and here is the obstacle which pre-
"vents it.

"Every year during the summer New Orleans is ravaged
"by the yellow fever. At this time, all to whom a removal
"is possible quit the city, ascend the Mississippi and Ohio,
"and seek in the central or northern states, in Philadelphia
"or Boston, a climate more salubrious. When the hot sea-
"son is past, they return to the south and resume their
"places in the counting house. These annual migrations
"are no trouble to a bachelor, but they would be incom-
"modious for a whole family. The American avoids all
"embarrassment by going without a wife and taking an ille-
"gitimate companion—he chooses her always among the free
"women of color—he gives her a sort of dowry, and the young
"woman finds herself honored by a union which connects
"her with a white man; she knows she cannot be his wife—
"it is much in her eyes that she is loved by him. She
"could, according to our laws, have married a mulatto, but
"such an alliance would not have raised her from her class.
"The mulatto, besides, would have had no power to protect
"her. In becoming the wife of the man of color, she would
"have perpetuated her degradation; in prostituting herself
"to the white she elevates herself. All the young women
"of color are educated in these prejudices, and from the ten-
"derest age, their parents fashion them for corruption.—
"There is a species of public balls where only white men
"and females of color are admitted; the husbands and bro-
"thers of the latter are by no means received, the mothers
"themselves are accustomed to be present; they are witnesses
"of the homage addressed to their daughters, they encour-
"age and rejoice in it. When an American is smitten with

“a girl, it is of her mother that he demands her ; she makes
“the best bargain she can, and exacts a greater or less price
“according to the freshness of her daughter. All this passes
“without mystery ; these monstrous unions have not even
“the reserve of vice which conceals itself from shame as
“virtue does from modesty : they expose themselves openly
“to all eyes without any infamy or blame attaching to the
“men who have formed them. When the American of the
“North has made his fortune, he has attained his end. The
“day has come in which he quits New Orleans, never to
“return. His children, and she who for ten years has lived
“as his wife, are no longer any thing to him. The woman
“of color then sells herself to another. Such is the lot of
“females of the African race in Louisiana.”

This raking open of the kennels of American shame did not reconcile Ludovic to the prejudice, nor inspire him with a particle of submission. He proposed if Maria would join her lot to his, to leave the land of “odious prejudices,” and go to that land of “light and liberty,” New England.—“Alas,” replied Nelson, “the prejudices against the people of color, it is true, are less powerful in Boston than in New Orleans, but they are no where dead.” “Well,” I replied, “I detest these prejudices and know how to brave them : it is infamous baseness to forsake the victim of undeserved reproach.”

The young lady herself made no concealments. She frankly apprized the foreigner what he had to expect and in terms worthy to be remembered. “Do you know,” said she to me, “how you dishonor yourself in speaking to me ? If you were to be seen with me in a public place, it would be said—that man has parted with decency—he is in company with a colored woman.”

“Ah ! Ludovic, look at the sad reality coolly : to associate your life with a poor creature like me, is to embrace a condition worse than death.

“Never doubt it,” she added with a voice of inspiration, “it is God himself who has separated the blacks from the whites. This separation is found every where : *in the hospitals where humanity suffers ; in the churches where it prays ; in the prisons where it repents ; in the graveyard where it sleeps the eternal sleep !*”

“What, I cried, even in the day of death ?”

"Yes," she answered with a serious and melancholy accent; "when I die, men will remember that a hundred years ago there was a mulatto in my family, and should my body be borne to the burial ground, it will be rejected, for fear its contact would soil the bones of a privileged race. Alas, my friend, our mortal remains must not mingle on earth, is not that a sign that our souls will not be united in heaven?"

But we will not dwell on the story. Nelson insisted that Ludovic, before he "braved" the monster prejudice, should fairly reconnoitre him—that he should spend six months in traversing the United States, and observing the manners of the people, and especially the relations of the whites to the colored. The "*epreuve*" was fruitful of discoveries.—In the city of New-York, to which he first directed his steps, the court of sessions, the prisons, the hospitals, the schools and the churches, furnished places and occasions in which he saw the most cruel insult heaped upon the blacks.

From a theatre which he visited in company with George Nelson, the latter was brutally thrust out for being a colored man, and the officers of the peace refused to give any redress. Before the third part of his probation was gone he had obtained a sufficiently deep insight into the matter of prejudice, and the more he saw of it, the more he clung to the unfortunate. An unexpected event hastened matters. The same Fernando d'Almanza who had driven Nelson from New Orleans, now routed him from Baltimore, and by the same means. He repaired with his daughter to New-York. It was agreed that the knot of Hymen should be tied, and as the bridegroom and bride were Catholic and Presbyterian,—it should be doubly tied according to the ceremonials of each church. At the date of this conclusion an anti-abolition mob had broken out in the city, and was making havoc of the humble dwellings of the colored people. This, however, did not disconcert the contracting parties as they supposed the secret of Maria's African blood safely concealed in her veins. But the same satanic d'Almanza, who it seems had pointed out George in the theatre as well as routed the family from Baltimore was preparing mischief for them here. They repaired to the church for the performance of the nuptials, the Catholic priest commenced; a rabid and blaspheming mob rushed upon them; the priest dropped the ring

and, *re infecta*, the parties were obliged to fly for their lives. Those who in sober fact witnessed the scenes of July, 1834, will appreciate the resolution which was now taken to postpone the ceremony till it could be performed in the wilds of Michigan, beyond the reach of the urbane and courteous mobocrats of our exalted white race. Thither Nelson, his daughter and Ludovic proceeded, in company with a tribe of emigrating Indians to which Nelson was to act as missionary. At Detroit they separated, Nelson proceeding up the lakes with the Indians, and Ludovic and a servant tarrying with Maria till she should recruit from the fatigue of the voyage. This she soon did, but for the want of a vessel the party left behind were obliged to proceed to their destination on the Saginaw by land—following through the forest an Indian trail. Weary, they arrived there, but did not meet Nelson. His vessel had not been heard of. They were hospitably accommodated in the cabin of a hunter, till they could build their own—that mysterious cottage on the border of that little flower encircled lake. It was completed only to be the tomb of Maria! Her father arrived to see his daughter lifeless, and to hear that his son George, who had been left behind, had fallen, in endeavoring to excite an insurrection of the slaves in Carolina. Such is a very bare outline of a story which M. de Beaumont has filled up for the entertainment and instruction of his countrymen with vastly more fact and philosophy than fiction.

Here it occurs to us that some cunning colonizationist (chromatologist), catching us in the talk, will ask. If Gustavus de Beaumont honestly wished to illustrate the wickedness of this prejudice, for the benefit of the world, why did he not show himself above it by selecting a heroine of the genuine black? Why must the Dulcinea be, after all, like the “swans of the great lakes,” if there is not really a *foundation for the prejudice in nature*, which the Frenchman had not the frankness to confess, nor the art to conceal? But the ingenious inquirer must not thus escape the edge of the author's argument both against the absurdity of the prejudice and the baseness of its origin. A word for M. de Beaumont, by and by. In the mean time the consequences which he has attributed to the *une goutte de sang noir*—“the single drop of African blood”—are not exaggerated.—And they show, first, that our prejudices are altogether and

in themselves inexpressible absurdities. We dislike certain people *because* they are *black*—but take away the black, and make every thing very nearly or quite as it should be, and, like spoiled children, we still dislike them, *'cause*.—Nay, it seems to be an aggravation that the rascally “one drop,” should be able to course the arteries unbetrayed but by the pedigree. The consequences of “the one drop” prove, in the second place, that we of the North are the most convenient possible tools of the slaveholders. It is one of the perquisites of slaveholding, which the masters exceedingly value, to mix the blood. Now, were the mongrel offspring to approach the high prerogatives of the exalted white race, *pari passu* with their approach to the complexion, it would operate completely to let down the bars of the slave system. The captives would march out of their prison house in a very few generations. The slaveholders understand the matter, and wisely *resist beginnings*. They hide themselves from their own flesh when they see it in mixture, and give it no sort of countenance. All this, however, would be in vain, but for our own theory of the “one drop.” Most opportunely we stand by and stop the leaks and hold down the cover for the slaveholder, so that the amount of population he has to operate upon in the great cauldron, shall not, in consequence of his mixing himself with it, leak out or boil over into the white race. That we do not overstate nor misapprehend this charming and useful theory we quote it as enunciated by a Connecticut divine. “In every part of the United States there is a broad and impassible line of demarcation between every man who has ONE DROP of African blood in his veins and every other class in the community. The habits, the feelings, all the prejudices of society—prejudices which neither refinement, nor argument, nor education, nor religion itself can subdue—mark the people of color, whether bond or free, as the subjects of a degradation *inevitable* and *incurable*. The African in this country belongs by birth to the very lowest station in society; and from that station he can never rise, be his *talents*, his *enterprise*, his *virtues* what they may. * * * * * They constitute a class by themselves, a class out of which no individual can be elevated, and below which none can be depressed.”* What turns “African

* Address to the Conn. Colonization Society. See *Af. Repository*, Vol. IV. p. 118.

blood" into a poison so unconscionably strong that dilution will not weaken it,—but a single drop will kill no matter what "talents, and enterprise, and virtues," as a drop of prussic acid kills a dog? We need not say, it is slavery.—The necessities of slavery require that this theory of the non-dilubility of the African blood should be co-extensive with the United States. The pious deprecants of amalgamation are laboring to extend it, and well they may be, for truly, if it be true, never did theory do so much for its believers. It makes amalgamation an impossibility, inasmuch as by it the mongrel is no mongrel, but a true African, on the otherside of a line harder to pass than the bile-heaving Atlantic. What boots it to colonize when we have such a line—impassible and eternal! But we digress.

Thirdly, the consequences of the "one drop," prove the insincerity of the common zeal in behalf of our Anglo-Saxon blood—for the love of slavery, rivers of it are given up to the downright tyranny of the *sang noir*. There is already in servile arteries enough of the "best blood" of our glorious ancestors to float a tolerable navy, yet if it should swell and whiten all the millions in bondage, it would still be under the dominion of the "one drop," and slavery, though of *whites*, would still be *African*. See here the curious process by which the descendants of Europeans by being born in America become Africans—by which the Anglo-Saxon blood, by flowing through the veins of chivalric slave-masters, becomes enslaved!

We undertook to say a word for M. de Beaumont, on the question whether he is himself free from the prejudice which he holds up to scorn. It is common for us, the enlightened people of the United States, to feel that in our prejudices all enlightened and refined people must sympathize, and we can hardly believe that in France or England a black face and wooly hair are no bar to a man's being received in good society. We shall not enter upon the question whether or not prejudice against color is known in Europe. It is obvious from the work before us, not to mention a cloud of other witnesses, that multitudes of not the meanest people feel no repugnance to the society of colored persons and no horror even of intermarriages. So little out of the way did M. de Beaumont think the latter enormity, that he gravely took for granted the truth of the stories set afloat by the

newspapers for the sake of raising mobs against the abolitionists—which charged them with having united colored and white in holy wedlock. Of the copious notes, in which he details matters of fact, one is devoted to the New-York riots of July 1834. He thus speaks of the abolitionists, “They are called *amalgamists* because, by means of intermarriages, they wish to effect the mixture of the two races. They have organized a society under the title of the Anti-Slavery Society, &c.—This body has the energy, which is imparted by profound conviction, an *honorable end*, (*but honnete*) and generous sympathies, but it is not numerous.” Couple this with his noble and enthusiastic admiration of our really free institutions and it can leave no doubt that M. de Beaumont is perfectly sincere in his abhorrence of our prejudice. It seems never to have entered his mind that there was any thing improper in marriages across the cord of caste, the parties being left to their choice. Indeed he frankly expresses his opinion that “intermarriages are certainly the better, if not the only means of a harmonious union of the black and white races. They are also the most manifest index of equality; for this two fold reason the marriages of this sort provoke the irritability of Americans more than any thing else.” He then relates, giving credit to the most respectable daily papers, stories of which the following is an example. “About the commencement of the year 1834, a minister of religion, the Reverend Doctor Beriah Green, having celebrated at Utica the marriage of a negro with a young lady of white complexion, there was in that city a sort of popular insurrection, in the upshot of which the Reverend was hung in effigy over the public street.” The enemies of the abolitionists may now console themselves that, admitting the truth of their heaviest charges, the verdict of the world is against them. The very acts which they sold their consciences to fasten on the abolitionists as crimes, by the unprejudiced are accounted praiseworthy. And so unable is our author to perceive even the indiscretion in the face of American prejudice, of such acts as were charged to the abolitionists, that he took the disclaimer of any design to encourage and promote intermarriages, published by some of the abolitionists during the reign of the mob, as an instance of yielding to the tyranny of public sentiment. After quoting the “Disclaimer,” he

adds, "All this proves that in the United States, there is, "under the rule of popular sovereignty, a majority whose "movements are irresistible, and which crushes, grinds to "powder, and annihilates every thing which opposes its "power and restrains its passions."

We will here beg the reader's attention to the comments of this high-minded and courteous foreigner, on the cause and tendency of the mob.

"Those who were not so severe against the partizans of "the blacks, were, at least, very indulgent towards their ene- "mies. The press wonderfully seconded these dispositions, "and furnished arguments to those who had only passion.

"The true cause of the hostility to the negroes, was, as "I have said before, the pride of the whites wounded by "the pretensions of equality set up by the people of color. "Now, a feeling of pride does not justify hatred and revenge. "The Americans would not have had justice on their side "in saying, 'We have let the negroes be beaten in our "cities,—we have suffered their private houses to be torn "down, their sacred temples to be profaned and demolished, "because they had the audacity to wish to equal us.' This, "which would have been the language of truth, would "have been a little too barefaced.

"Observe how the press relieved the Americans from this "embarrassment:—

"The partisans of the negroes, who wish the people of "color to be equal to the whites, demand the abolition of "slavery throughout the Union;—now this is to demand a "thing contrary to the Constitution of the United States: "in effect, this constitution guaranties to the slave states "the preservation of slavery so long as they shall please to "continue it. The North and the South have distinct in- "terests. Those of the South depend upon slavery. If "the North labors to destroy slavery in the South, it does "a thing hostile and contrary to the union of the states. "Therefore, to be a friend to the enfranchisement of the "negroes, is to be an enemy of the Union.'

"The natural consequence of this reasoning, is, that "every good man in the United States, ought to advocate "the slavery of the blacks. and that the real enemies of the "country are those who oppose it. The factious, who "gave themselves up for three days to the commission of the

“most iniquitous outrages, and the most impious, were, at least, animated with a good sentiment, whilst those who, by their philanthropy for an unfortunate race, had excited the just indignation of the whites, were traitors to their country. Such are the consequences of a sophism.

“Doubtless the southern states alone can abolish their own slavery; but how long since the citizens of the North lost the right of pointing out the faults of a bad law? They have destroyed slavery among themselves, shall they be forbidden to desire its destruction in a neighboring country? They make no law; they express a wish;—if this wish is criminal, what becomes of the right of discussion, the liberty to think and write? Shall this right cease because it is used to attack the most monstrous of institutions? The Americans permit the vilest pamphleteer to write publicly that their president is a scoundrel, a swindler, an assassin; yet an honorable man, filled with the deepest conviction, shall not be able to say to his fellow-citizens that he is sorry to see a whole race devoted to slavery; that his nature revolts at seeing the child torn from the bosom of its mother, the husband separated from the wife, man beaten and torn by man, and all this in the name of law! Finally, because there are still slaves at the South, must the free negro, who, at the North, aspires to the rights of a free man, be crushed without pity?”

But why do *we* meddle with the subject of caste? Our object is the abolition of slavery. Were this accomplished, the cord of caste would soon fall to pieces itself. So would we let it perish, were it not inseparably connected with slavery itself, so that the latter cannot be successfully attacked without breaking through the former. It was the conviction that our attack upon slavery was *honest*, that raised the cry of *amalgamation*. It is the verdict of common sense, that if slavery be opposed on the ground that a *man* cannot righteously be made matter of property, then a *man* must not any where be treated as if he were a *dog*. It was not the amalgamation of intermarriage, nor of social intercourse that was feared, but the amalgamation of rights, interests, means of acquiring wealth, and respectability, and power. Grant the negro the same rights as any other citizen, admit him to the same facilities of prosecuting his fortune, and the public would not care a rush about intermar-

riages. It is the substantial equality they hate, not the "index" of it.

Nor do they hate the color, nor the hair, nor the acuteness of the facial angle, nor the size of the lips, nor the protrusion of the heel, nor any other, if there be other, physical peculiarity. We are told the blacks may thank the abolitionists for all the persecution they have suffered; that before the abolitionists taught them to aspire to *equality* with the whites, they were kindly treated. So it is the equality which is hated—not the color. The abolitionists have not made them blacker, but have got them out of their *places*. And the very places that many of them occupy, show that their persons are not the objects of disgust. Why are they admitted, as musicians and waiters, to the most brilliant and tasteful assemblies, where no expense is spared to have every thing that can please and nothing to disgust. Why does the wealthy citizen place two negroes on his splendid coach, one of whom is to have the honor of handing in and out his delicate wife and daughters? Individual deformities may be avoided in the selection in these cases; but the race is honored,—as mere animals, the negro men and women are greatly rejoiced in.

The people who indulge what is called the prejudice against color, but which is truly the prejudice of caste, may be divided into two classes. First come the violent negro-haters. They not only hate colored people, (we do not say despise, for there seems to be a suspicion about them that, with fair play, the colored man would be their superior,) but they are determined others shall hate them too. They would thrust their negro-hatred down our throats. They are not only resolved that we shall not bring negro-equality between the wind and their nobility, that we shall not disturb their *devotions* in the house of God by seating negroes in our pews, but we shall not seat them in our own parlors. They take it upon them to say, that we shall not choose our familiar friends except from the orthodox color. They take upon themselves the care of our tables and our daughters, to see that we conform to the true Brahminical code. Kind souls!—they beg us not to put them to the trouble of breaking the riot act, profaning churches, pulling down houses, and making the condition of the "wretched negroes" worse than it was before. These worthies are mightily dis-

tressed for the peace and good order of society. They abhor slavery, many of them, but are so troubled with the "anomalous condition" of the free blacks, that they think they would be better off either in slavery or in Liberia. They are sure that, if the abolitionists succeed in elevating the colored people to an equality with the whites, civil war will be the consequence,—hence how justifiable a little rioting and blood-shed by way of prevention! If any inquire why these valiant defenders of the white blood cannot bear that abolitionists should associate with colored people, the reply is easy. The abolitionists have stood in society upon an equal footing with themselves, and if they now place themselves upon an equality with colored men, the whole world are mathematicians enough to see, that, things which are equal to the same being equal to one another, the negroes are equal to the negro-haters. And what an insult this would be to their "brethren of the South!" Negroes in the condition of chattels, in one part of the Union, and in another, to all intents and purposes, equal to white citizens! The *nominal* freedom of brutes, semi-homines, turned into real liberty and honorable regard! The class of which we are speaking, cannot bear to allow such an insult to be given to the dignity of slaveholders—whether from a natural sympathy, or from a desire to be slaveholders themselves, we will not undertake to decide.

These are the men who scorn intermeddling with other men's matters, interfering with other people's "domestic" affairs, yet they are pleased to dictate to their neighbors in regard to their social arrangements, and especially to direct them as to the marriage of their children. These are the men who have installed the FEAR OF AMALGAMATION into the office of *Pontifex morum*, and wo to the man or woman who shall not make pilgrimage and kiss His Holiness' great toe.

The second class of the prejudiced seem to bear to the other somewhat the relation of dupes to deceivers. They would not dictate to others, nor drive the colored people out of the country. They wish to have them rise and do well, but they do not like to associate with them. They think there is after all some foundation in nature for separate tables, and corner pews—an amicable sort of caste. It must not be supposed that they have no substantial benevolence

towards the colored people. Many of them have not a little. Their hearts overflow with kindness for all flesh. Would that we possessed a tythe of it. Their prejudices are *Lamb-like*, after the pattern of the author of *Elia*, who says in his felicitous way, "In the negro countenance you will often meet with strong traits of benignity. I have felt yearnings of tenderness towards some of these faces—or rather masks—that have looked out kindly upon one in casual encounters in the streets and highways. I love what Fuller beautifully calls, these 'images of God cut in ebony.' But I should not like to associate with them, to share my meals and my good-nights with them—*because they are black.*" We would respectfully inquire whether Mr. Lamb settled his likes and dislikes by "casual encounters in the streets and highways." If he did, he is a very good prototype of the class we are describing. The established customs of society prevent any nearer approaches than these "casual encounters," and it is very natural that they should not wish any nearer. A child thinks he shall never like to sit in the lap of a man with shaggy eyebrows, or a long nose, but a few candies and *trials* change his opinion. Mr. Lamb was delighted to meet black people in the street—because he had often met them there. Perhaps if he had seen them only in Africa, he would have said, 'I have had yearnings of tenderness towards some of those faces, but I would not like to meet them in London, *because they are black.*' Perhaps, on the other hand, if he had often met their kind looks, connected with due proprieties of dress and behavior, in social circles, he would have admired their very blackness. Somebody says we are a bundle of habits. There are a great many good things that we are quite averse to, till we have given them a fair trial. Now be it remembered that we do not wish, as has been a thousand times foolishly and falsely said of us, to force social intercourse with colored people down the throat, either of the public, or of individuals; there is a sacredness of *free-choice* belonging to every individual which we neither dare nor wish to violate; but we affirm that a white person does injustice to the people of color, as a class, by proclaiming, that he does not like to eat with them, till he has made a fair trial. The question to be decided is, whether a man is necessarily a disagreeable companion to a white man, "because he is black"—not be-

cause he is ill-mannered, or slovenly, or selfish, or vain, or stupid, or contentious—but *because he is black* ;”—it is to be decided how far the physical peculiarities which God himself has stamped upon the colored man, form an anti-social wall of partition. What right has any man to dispose of this problem, pregnant with human destiny, by his baseless, question-begging prejudices? It would certainly seem to be the duty of a philanthropic white person, in view of the enormous evils of caste, to seek out proper cases, where, *besides the “African” characteristics*, as few preventives as possible shall stand in the way of social intercourse, and see, by a sufficient number of trials, whether individuals of the two castes can pleasantly “share their meals and their good nights together.” This, not to broach the question whether the intercourse between what are called the upper and lower classes of society needs reform, would seem to be the least that even patriotism could accept of any one professing to be her votary.

And suppose the trial to have been fairly made, and to have resulted, as when *fairly* made it always will, against the cord of caste, shall a man, out of regard to custom, refrain from intercourse with the colored, shall he abandon the fruits of his discovery? The tyrant custom has been tried, and brought in guilty; is he to retain his throne? And will reasonable third parties—mere lookers-on, though not uninterested, object to an intercourse which is not only agreeable to the directly concerned, but which tends to heal that wound of society hitherto considered immedicable? Will those who wish for peace and harmony, seek to electrify all others with their own repellencies? We believe they will not. We shall be disappointed if there is not found to be a large class, who, when they are made to see the intimate connection of caste with slavery, will refuse to recognize the distinction on which it is based. We do not think so meanly either of the science, or humanity, or religion of our countrymen, as to believe that they will *always* mistake the color of the skin for the criterion of the soul, or prove themselves brutal by denying the manhood of others, or seal their own hypocrisy by preaching against caste in Hindostan while they cherish it at home. When the mighty delusion which has repressed the benevolent tendencies, both native and christianized, of the human heart is dispell-

ed, there will be a reaction. We shall no longer fear to show common kindness to the man who has fallen among thieves, lest we should be taunted with being about to adopt a despised Samaritan into our family circle ;—we shall no longer fear to cultivate friendship with the colored, lest, peradventure, it should lead the willing parties somewhat further ! Far from us be the wish, *in the abstract*, to spoil any of our fellow-citizens of that choice store of witty, and wise jests, and gestures whereby they seek to maintain that honorable distinction which they owe to the color of their outer integuments—let them use their jokes while the wit is in them—but we look for the day when it will not only be less creditable to control individual free agency by brute force, but when it will take a great deal more wit to do it by ridicule.

It is no part of our present purpose to show that the negro is a man. He is in truth admitted to be so, by the very laws which hold him in bondage—by the very customs which consign him to an inferior caste. Nor is it our purpose to prove that, as a man, he is naturally equal to the white. No matter whether he be equal or not. If he be equal, surely he ought not to be made inferior ;—if he be naturally inferior, there is no need of *caste* to keep him so. The law, which supports caste by reason of inequality, should forbid the intercourse, and especially the marriage, of unequal individuals. No man should admit guests to his table till he has had them gauged and weighed, both corporeally and intellectually. No man should take a wife either above or below his own degree on the scale of humanity. There should be public weigh-masters in these matters. If the principle is good for classes, it is good for individuals,—we mean, simply, the principle of *other people's dictation*, whether in the shape of law or custom.

Our limits will confine us to a glance at some of the mischiefs of caste. In the first place, it injures our national character. The civilized world look upon our quarrel about color with disinterested coolness. On the one side they see the rich, the honorable, the learned whites, clamoring against the blacks as a poor, inferior, ignorant, degraded, incurably wretched race of people, who would be better off out of the country than in it, and without whom the country would be better off. And yet they see these

boasting whites in terrors, lest the blacks should become rich, intelligent, virtuous, and every way as respectable as themselves; shutting them out of honorable employments, out of schools, out of every avenue to preferment; mobbing down all their attempts to become what they are banished from society for not being; calumniating a whole class of men, and then laying out all their brute force to make their calumny true. On the other side, they see the blacks striving to rise from a condition to which they have been degraded without their own fault; asking only for fair play; claiming to be judged of after enjoying equal advantages. Is it doubtful on which side the sympathies of disinterested foreigners will be found? They cannot fail to see that the treatment, which the colored people receive, is evidence of unutterable meanness on the part of the whites. To shut the door on the victim of misfortune is disgraceful enough; but to abuse him as a beggar, and then kick him from the threshold for offering to earn his bread, is much more so; yet it is only a faint type of the working of our American caste. Here is a foul blot on American character, a share of which every white American, who goes abroad, must bear with him.

Again,—our caste is a reproach to republicanism. Let it be understood, that, in the model republic of the world, there is a minority, or a sect, or a caste, which has nothing to expect but to be trampled upon without mercy, and who will not choose despotism? Let it be understood, that, in a republic, men may be born to infamy, though not to honor; and what honorable man will not prefer monarchy with its hereditary nobility? Our prejudice props the tottering thrones of all Europe; it rejoices the tyrant-hearts of the nabobs of Asia; it strengthens every where those vampires of the human race,

“Whose robber rights are in their swords.”

Again,—it is a disgrace to our Protestant Christianity. We profess to reverence the BIBLE;—we appeal to it as of paramount authority; yet we are condemned by it in unequivocal terms. “My brethren,” says James, “have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory, with *respect of persons*. For if there come into your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel; and

“there come in, also, a poor man in vile raiment; and ye
“have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and
“say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place; and say to
“the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool;
“are ye not then partial in yourselves, and are become
“judges of evil thoughts?” In our churches, men are *cornered up*, not for the vile raiment in which they have clothed themselves, but for the raiment in which God has clothed them. And though in Christ Jesus, there is to be neither “Barbarian nor Scythian;” yet certain of our own fellow citizens are bid sit by themselves, because they are Africans! “That which long astonished me,” says de Beaumont, “was to find this separation of whites and blacks
“in the religious edifices. Who would believe it?—ranks
“and privileges in Christian churches! Sometimes the
“blacks are confined in an obscure corner of the temple,
“sometimes wholly excluded.* Imagine what would be the
“displeasure of a genteel assembly, if it were obliged to be
“mingled with coarse and ill clad people. The meeting
“in the holy temple, is the only amusement which the
“Sabbath authorizes. For American society, the church is
“promenade, concert, ball, and theatre;—the ladies there
“display themselves elegantly dressed. The Protestant
“temple, is the saloon where one prays. Americans would
“be distressed to meet there people of low condition.
“Would it not be grievous, too, if the hideous sight of a
“black face should come in to tarnish the lustre of a brilliant
“assembly? In a congregation of fashionable people, the
“majority will necessarily have a mind to shut the door
“against people of color: the majority willing so, nothing
“can hinder it.

“The Catholic Churches are the only ones which admit
“neither of privileges nor exclusions: the black population
“finds access to them as well as the white. This tolerance
“of Catholicism, and this rigorous police of the Protestant
“temples, is not accidental, but pertains to the very nature
“of the two systems.”†

* M. de Beaumont, perhaps, did not understand that it is the *cornering* which operates as an exclusion.

† If the work of de Beaumont had been of the Fiddler and Trollope kind, it would long ago have been printed in our language for the gratification of those who know how to repay such travelers, principal and interest, in their own coin. But our booksellers have no notion of having their houses pulled down about their ears, for translating too much truth about American prejudice.

If it be true that colored people are admitted, on equal terms, to catholic churches, we are quite sure, with M. de Beaumont, that it must be due to the *nature of the catholic system*—an implicit submission to foreign authority in spiritual matters—and not to its better morality or the greater freedom from prejudice of its American devotees. But in furnishing to the Frenchman ground for this unfavorable comparison we think the Protestant churches have not unlikely done more to confirm Catholicism in Europe, than all their "Protestant Associations" will ever do to check it in America.

The inhumanity of the church is the food of infidelity.—Slavery in the church makes infidels by thousands, caste in the church is still more mischievous, because more extensive. If Christianity cannot be purified from this corruption, her doom is sealed. Her efforts to convert the world will recoil to her own destruction.

Finally, this institution of caste, this disfranchising of a whole class of our countrymen, is an immense waste of the resources of our country. The people of a country are its riches. A country in which there are all varieties of men, and in which all the departments of human achievement are open to all, is like one in which there are all sorts of mines, and all of them open. What mines of incalculable wealth are there not hid in the hardy constitutions, the patient industry, the light-heartedness, the peaceful dispositions, the thirst for knowledge, the strong social affections, the patriotism and the noble generosity of our colored brethren ! All this wealth, some of us, forsooth, would keep buried, or fling it across the ocean, because we do not like the looks of the ore !

We deny that he is the greatest hero who has climbed to the greatest height. In estimating what a man has done, we must take into the account what he had to do with. George Washington saved his country. But he was born to her smiles, and dandled on the knees of her favor. Toussaint Louverture also saved his country. He was born a slave. We avow that when we look for those examples of heroism, of which a nation does well to be proud, we shall expect to find them most noble and most abundant below the summits of society—individuals who have not risen to the top, but have started from the bottom. We shall find among

them the hero, who, with his wife and children, started from a cotton plantation in Georgia, and followed, over floods and mountains, the *north star*, till he trod a soil which cannot be trodden by slaves, and is now the honest cultivator of that soil ; we shall find among them the heroine, who has ransomed herself and her children by nightly toil over the wash-tub, and her, who, by the same honorable occupation, has ransomed eleven of her enslaved brethren and sisters ; we shall find among them the noble-hearted colored men and women, who, when the yellow-fever was desolating Philadelphia, and white people fled from their own brothers and sisters, stood by to wet the parched lip, to soothe the dying agony—to perform the last sad offices, for the race that despised them. Talk about the misfortune of having such a population among us—the natural repugnance which prevents us from walking or sitting or eating with such people, because they have black skins—pass about, in mock-benevolence, contribution boxes to freight them across the ocean ! Oh ! it is the consummation of cruel insult, cursed pride, base ingratitude, abominable sin and self-destructive folly !—May our reputation stand before the world in everlasting pillory, if, consenting to be the slave of this insane custom, we ever refuse to honor those to whom honor is so justly due,—that portion of our fellow citizens falsely called Africans.

THE DIVERSITIES OF MEN.

IN examining the question—*whether the known influence of natural causes is sufficient to account for the diversities, which characterize the inhabitants of the different continents*,—it seems appropriate to inquire what causes act with greatest energy in each, and what analogies can be found, showing the tendency of any of those causes to produce the peculiarities of the people subjected to their influence.

The influence of *heat* over all material substances is al-

most omnipotent in changing their magnitude and form, and consequently their color. For the color of a body depends wholly on its power of transmitting, absorbing or reflecting the rays of colored light, as they severally fall upon its surface.

The similarity of the vegetable and the animal kingdoms, in a number of important particulars, is a subject of common remark, and the ground of innumerable daily comparisons. Every observant person has been struck with the changes produced in the growth and appearance of plants by variations of temperature, or by a change of soil. When the appropriate food of the plant is afforded in abundance, it acquires a rapid growth; but dwarfish hardy plants are produced by dry or sterile soils. The diminutive oxen of our oakland neighbors, and the little horses fed by the Indians with the undergrowth of the forest, are uncommonly hardy. In like manner *the poor people* of countries where the law of caste deprives them of the sympathy and assistance of the wealthy, are generally much inferior, both in beauty and in size. The Soodras of Hindostan are not only blackened by continued exposure, but, owing to their restricted food and frequent destitution, *dwarfed*; while the lordly Brahmins sitting under the shade and reveling in abundance, possess a commanding stature and comparatively fair complexion. The *larves* of most kinds of insects, that burrow in the cavities of the earth, the roots of plants, and the leaves and stalks of vegetables kept in a cellar or a thickly shaded nursery—when exposed to the direct influence of the solar rays—exchange their whiteness for a deep tinge of black, brown or green. It may here be remarked that the leaves and flowers of plants consist of two transparent coats, containing a colored pulp, which gives them their peculiar hue. It has been found that the human skin, also, consists of three layers, or coats: the outer and inner skins, which are colorless, and an intermediate substance called the *mucous web*, whose color varies in different individuals, according to their complexions. Now the color of men, as well as of plants, increases in proportion to the thickness of this mucous, or pulpy, substance, in the same manner that a heavy coat of paint gives a hue to the surface which it covers, distinguishing and well defined. The leaves of *corn* planted in a barren spot, owe their *paleness* not less to the

thinness of the pulp, than to a deficiency in its color. Both these causes operate in the production of the deep rich tints of the tropical regions; for *there* the size and thickness of the flowercups, and the leaves (one of the former being large enough for a child's hat, and of the latter for a good sized tent) are equally astonishing with the richness of their dyes. It is evident, therefore, that the mucous coat being of precisely the same color in two individuals, but *thicker in the one*, his complexion must have a darker cast than that of his thinner-skinned companion. If we find, then, people remarkable for the thickness of their skin, even in a cold climate; their complexion, according to our rule, will be similar to that of people in general, who live in a much warmer clime.

Plants, removed to a climate, or soil, very different from their own, manifest a wonderful power of adapting their conformation and habits to the circumstances, which principally affect them. Thus several of the *annual herbs* of the polar regions, when transferred to a temperate clime, become perennial shrubs; our shrubs become in the torrid zone, stately trees. The *quincetree*, in the south of France where it is cultivated, is an evergreen. The tendency of the largest kinds of *corn* to depreciate, and of the smallest to improve in size and fruitfulness in this climate, is another example of this adapting power; and will appear especially striking, when we consider that all the varieties of this plant, from the luxuriant gourdseed of the South to the pigmy species of Nantucket, are from the same original stock. Some *trees*, covered in their wild state with thorns, when cultivated, cast off this formidable armor of defence, and present only smooth and verdant branches. All the different kinds of the *apple*, also, are derived from the same original, and owe their peculiarities, principally, to their various climates, soils, situations, and to the degrees of culture they have received. "The *ramunculus*, in its native soil is yellow; when transplanted, it acquires various colors.—Tulips, auricolas, and dianthus, of the same species, differ greatly from one another in color. The smell, taste, color, and size, of pears, plumbs, and other fruits, are changed by a difference of seasons." As the *year* changes its seasons, beasts, birds, and insects, change their covering, and to some extent, their form and habits. The mirth and activity of

spring laying aside the cumbrous garments and haggard poverty of winter for the beauty and abundance of summer, cannot fail to suggest to every mind many a subject of astonishment and gratitude for the wisdom and goodness of the Creator, who, with their varying circumstances varies the wants and habits of the animal creation. "As we approach the *poles*, we find every thing progressively whiten; bears, foxes, hares, falcons, crows, and blackbirds, all assume the same common livery." The air in those icy regions, is always of a low temperature, and consequently, it must be of the highest importance to the preservation of animal life *that the heat of the body should not be transmitted*; accordingly a white covering, the best of all colors *for retaining heat*—is found universally prevalent. In the warm and tropical regions, on the contrary, deep hues and often black, form the prevalent color of all animated tribes. In the tropics, the external heat, though rarely raised to the temperature of the body, is still so great as to impel the system to excessive action, and in this way, would destroy life by the ragings of fever, unless the color were such as to allow of the transmission of heat from the body with the utmost freedom.

Let us now consider briefly, whether the diversities of the *human* race are greater than clime and manner of life have made in single species of the *brutes*. "*Quadrupeds*, of the same family, in the state of nature, are generally of one color, but they become of various colors by domestication and rich pastures. *Wild cattle*, are brown, tame cattle are of many colors. *Horses*, *deers*, and *goats*, brought into a state of servitude, or handled and fed by men, change their color. The *horse* of Arabia is strong and beautiful, with short hair and a smooth skin—in Russia, he is clumsy, and is clothed in winter, with a shaggy, frizzled coat—in China, he is weak and spiritless. The *cow* among the Eluth Tartars, is seven or eight feet high—in Cuba she has large horns, in Iceland, no horns. The immediate descendants of excellent wool-bearing *sheep*, have been known to alter in form, and become hairy as goats by removal from a temperate to a hot climate. *Birds*, of the same species, in their wild state, are all of the same color; they acquire different colors by domestication and a change of food. *Pigeons*, in the state of nature, are alike; but domestic pigeons are of many

colors. The *turkey* in America, its native country, is a dark colored bird, almost black ; and the whole family are of one color. By domestication, many of them have become speckled and some white." The English, by separating into herds by themselves, the horses, cattle, sheep, and swine, excelling in some particular ; and by carefully removing, for successive generations, all the young of only ordinary quality, have succeeded in forming several distinct breeds of each kind of animals, distinguished for their peculiar excellencies—some for size, some for speed, some for beauty. The *swine*, which, in all its varieties, is known to have sprung from the wild boar, not being indigenous to America, we are enabled to trace their changes with perfect certainty ; thus the swine imported from Europe into Cuba by the Spaniards have become a race of monsters, double the height and magnitude of the stock from which they were bred and with *solid hoofs*, not less than 12 or 14 inches in circumference. In several instances, swine have been reared of the enormous weight of 12 or 1500 pounds, equal to a yoke of good sized oxen. "The fineness and coarseness of the wool or hair, the firmness and flavor of the flesh, and in some degree the color of the skin and extent of the stature, are all influenced by *the nature of the diet*." Thus swine and other animals, fed on madder root, are found to have their bones tinged with red. In Piedmont, the swine are black ; in Batavia, reddish brown ; in Normandy, white. Among the white swine of Normandy, the bristles on the body are longer and softer than among other swine ; and even those on the back are flaccid, and cannot be used by the brush-makers. In like manner, *fair hair* is soft ; in the Albinos, or chalk-white persons, being a perfect down ; black hair is coarser and often crisped. Keeping in mind *that the countenance is darkened by whatever has a tendency to render the skin coarse and thick* ; as frequent exposure to a changeful atmosphere, strong and greasy food, as well as stimulating drinks and heat of climate, (to say nothing of the coloring matter applied to the external surface in the form of dust and smoke,) we will take a cursory view of the nations of the earth.

"In the different climates of Africa, Asia, and Europe, there are men of all the different shades, or colors, from white to black, there are hardly any two nations perfectly

alike ;—short, middle-sized, and tall ; white, brown, tawny, red, olive, copper-colored, swarthy, and black :—*features*, very coarse, or very fine ;—*hair*, brown, fair, red, and black, long, curled, frizzled, or woolly ; we find innumerable combinations of these different shapes and colors, according to the different degrees of latitude, temperature, or civilization. *How many races shall we count ?* The number five has been taken ; but fifty might be taken for the same reason. Among the blacks, there are coarse and delicate features ; strong and slender forms ; deep black, and innumerable varieties of lighter shades, until they become swarthy ; from flat noses and thick lips to high noses and thin lips ; from short frizzled wool to long straight hair. Among the nations, who are called fair or white, there are so many shapes and shades, that no two men could be expected to agree in fixing where the white ends, and where the tawny, the red, the brown, or the olive begins.” The *thick-skinned Esquimaux Indians*, far-famed for filthy habits and smoking huts, “are of a yellowish gray color. Their blood is dark, dense, warm, and oily ; their hands and feet are as clammy as bacon ; and the effluvia from their bodies is extremely offensive.” The Mogul Tartars are another example of the disgusting effects of barbarian habits. While the “Moguls, who invaded India, and settled in Hindostan, have acquired the darker complexion, the figure and features, of the people they supplanted ;” and the *Portuguese* colony, settled at Mitomba, have become perfect negroes ; the Falatahs, or *Foulahs*, who have sojourned with their flocks for successive generations, among the gross features and thick skins of the naked aborigines of *Guinea*, by their mode of life, and peculiar neatness of dress, and cleanliness of person, have preserved their general elegance of form and the delicacy of their features. Owing to these circumstances, the hair of the Foulahs is fine, and the skin thin ; consequently their color is only of a brown, or tawny, caste. *America*, although it stretches from the extreme North beyond the fiftieth degree South of the Equator, cannot strictly be said to possess any *torrid region*. “The immense extent of ocean by which its shores are bounded, its lofty mountains, running continuously from one extremity of the continent to the other, with their tops covered with perpetual snow,”

and its dense forests, "cool the scorching breezes of the torrid zone, and convert it into a temperate clime." Of the inhabitants of its *frozen region*, mention has been already made. All the other parts of this vast continent, have a moderate temperature, compared with that of Guinea; consequently the curly hair and black skin of the negro, are not to be expected among the aboriginal Americans. We find, however, different shades of complexion according to the actual variations of heat. "The Araucans of Chili," says Molina, "are white and red, with blue eyes, fair hair, and regular features, like Europeans in the middle of the northern temperate zone." "In *Europe*, the complexion grows darker as the climate becomes warmer. The complexion of the French is darker than that of the Germans, while the nations of the South of Germany and France are darker than those of the North." In *Asia*, the same change is observable; the people of the temperate clime of Asia Minor having a fair complexion, while the inhabitants of the South of Persia are remarkably sallow, and those of Hindostan, nearly black. "The *Jews*, though scattered over the face of the earth, have, in general, remained a distinct and separate race; yet they are found fair in Britain, brown in Spain and Portugal, copper-colored in Arabia and Egypt, and almost wholly black at Cochin," on the Malabar coast of Hindostan. It should be further remarked, that the Jews, by the force of climate alone, approximate in features, as well as complexion, to the original inhabitants of the several countries in which they reside. As the surface of the ocean, and of other large bodies of water, can never freeze, until the whole mass of water becomes intensely cold, and as the perpetual agitation of the waves in summer mixes the cold waters of the deep with the heated surface, the *wind* passing over it acquires a moderate temperature. On this account, small islands and countries abounding with seas and lakes, are noted for the mildness of their climate. Hence, the superior fairness of the complexion of the *Greeks* to that of other nations in the same latitude. *Abyssinia*, both on account of its *elevated position* and the abundance of water, though in the same latitude with the burning region of Guinea, enjoys a milder climate, and its inhabitants are lighter colored by several shades. The southern extremity of Hindostan, also, being fanned by the

breezes of the ocean, both from the East and West, is cooler by far than countries of the same latitude, in the central and western parts of Africa and in New Holland. Indeed the color of the *New Hollanders* is scarcely distinguishable from that of the blacks of Africa. The vast extent and compact form of this region, its excessive drouth, and the savage manners of its inhabitants, sufficiently account for the blackness of their complexion. Wherever a colony of people have settled among others of a very different complexion, although they have been a great length of time in acquiring the characteristic appearance of the natives, *yet, in all cases, where the native customs have been adopted*, the features and complexion have gradually assimilated themselves till no trace of distinction remained. "The descendants of French and English families, who have lived two or three generations in the *West Indies*, are tending fast towards the complexion of the original inhabitants; indeed the finest skin, by a few months residence in the *West Indies*, and frequent exposure to the sun and wind, becomes almost brown." It is on all hands admitted that the people of these *United States*, "descended, as they are, from many different European nations, have acquired a uniform cast of features," the complexion being considerably darker, and the form more slender, than of the original colonists. "The *African*, with a flat nose, thick lips, arched shins, and large hips, in a few generations after he is removed to a *better climate*, and has been accustomed to sit, and dress, and feed, like civilized people, *is greatly improved in form*." It is even maintained by Dr. Smith, of New Jersey, that the negroes in this country, *not amalgamated with the whites*, are gradually losing the curled hair and black complexion of their African progenitors. The fact that a colony of *gipsies*, who settled in one of our southwestern states a number of years since, have so completely lost their distinctive traits, as to be entirely similar to the other inhabitants,—the analogy of the vegetable world, and the well-attested change of the color of every kind of animals into white in the polar regions, render it highly probable that his statement is correct. We have, indeed, testimony as full and positive on this point as need be desired. We learn from Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, that the *Egyptians* in their day were woolly headed and black, and were sup-

posed to be a colony from Ethiopia. Historians, writing some hundred years after, have described them as somewhat less black than formerly. At the present day, the *Copts*, who are accounted the descendants of the ancient Egyptians, are a *brown* race. *It seems certain, therefore*, especially since the discovery of statues of the *negro* caste in Egypt, and the investigations of Professor Blumenbach, who has found Egyptian mummies to possess the features characteristic of the negro,—*that, in the process of time, the descendants of negroes have acquired the very same complexion, which the descendants of Europeans have acquired by residing for successive generations in the same climate.*

Seeing that it is sometimes alleged, in disproof of the oneness of the human family, that some of its tribes have scarce a perceptible advance of the brutes in intellect, I subjoin a little *touching the evidence* on which that allegation is based. Spanish travelers of high repute, describing the Indians of this country, say that “stupidity, gluttony, cowardice, and effeminacy, characterize them. Abstraction, or a chain of reasoning, is far beyond their power. *Even the negroes from all the different provinces of Africa*, learn more readily, and comprehend subjects above the capacity of the Americans.” Cicero pronounced the savage Britons blockheads, fit only for slavery. The Greeks called all men barbarians *but themselves*. *Only sixty years since*, English officers, who had served in America, said in parliament concerning *our grandfathers*, “the Americans are, by nature, cowards, and so effeminate, that they are disabled from going through the service of a campaign. Five regiments will drive them from one end of the continent to the other.” What are the Greeks *now* but savages? What are the descendants of the old Romans, compared with those of the despised Britons, but slaves? The poor Indian, traduced below the brutes, has not only shown all the virtues of the ancient Spartans,—he has also put the defamers of his intellect to eternal silence. The Chaldeans, the black Egyptians, the Greeks, the Romans, the Saracens, have each in turn held the supremacy in the literary world; each in turn has sunk into listlessness and ignorance. The Chinese and Hindoos, for many hundred years, have been wasting away their stock of knowledge. Paganism and tyranny

combined, have never failed to cover a land with darkness that may be felt. Liberty alone has given a momentary light. *Liberty and Christianity* will render all men of every shape and every shade intelligent, reasoning, and holy. In view of the evidence presented, *can* any one doubt that custom and climate fully account for the diversities of the human form? Shall the baseless and disproved theories of the infidel *always* hold professed Christians in covered, but real and practical, skepticism? Shall "the mother of harlots" and "the father of lies" persuade us that God and mammon, uniting their interests, require the enslavement of pagans, to fit them for Heaven; and when we have debased them that they are merely noble, but soulless, brutes? The withering dogma, that no man can gain without another's loss, begins at last to be found a pestilential lie. Soon may equal and exact justice be mutually rendered by all men of every state and nation; then shall liberty, wealth, and happiness bless the world. M.

See Williamson on Climate, Edinburgh Encyclopedia, Lander's Travels, Good's Book of Nature, Sumner's Botany, Robertson's America, Marshall's Washington, &c.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF AMERICAN COMMERCE.

THE Constitution of the United States makes it the duty of Congress "to regulate," if need be, "commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states." Hence it seems to us, that if under the name of "commerce," either external or internal, there should spring up any nefarious system of outrage upon mankind—any atrocious violation of the laws of nature, it would be the duty of Congress utterly to weed it out, and leave nothing but commerce properly so called. In our cities a power to *regulate the streets*, gives the proper officers authority to *remove* nuisances, and even to *shut up* a street which it would be dangerous to pass through. There is abundant evidence to us that the American inter-state slave trade is an intolerable evil, and consequently we think that Congress, in *regulating commerce* ought to regulate it out of existence. A highly valued correspond-

ent has furnished us with some striking illustrations of this subject, which we give below.

SLAVE MONGERS.—A person has lately been hung in North Carolina for kidnapping—but dealers in slaves, and slave drivers in Maryland and elsewhere, are not to be reached by the laws. The time will come, when this business will be as severely punished, as it is heartily detested by all honorable men. We do not mean to cast reproach on the owners of slaves. Humanity itself forbids general emancipation unless gradual, and with provision for the relief of the emancipated, but we cannot conjure up to our imagination a character more monstrous than that of a dealer in slaves, as ordinary merchandise.—*Niles' Register*, for June 28, 1828.

DOMESTIC SLAVE TRADE.—The New-York Gazette says, "It is but a few weeks since we observed the arrival at New Orleans of three vessels from Norfolk, having on board nearly six hundred slaves."—*Niles' Register*, Dec. 27, 1828.

It appears from the reports of the Comptroller of South Carolina that the number of slaves in that State decreased in one year, from 1824 to 1825, thirty-two thousand seven hundred and twenty-seven; and in the next year, one thousand one hundred and twenty-nine: total decrease in two years, 33,856—being more than one eighth of the whole number (260,282) in 1824.—*Niles' Register*, April 8, 1829.

THE INTERNAL SLAVE TRADE.—A Portsmouth (Ohio) paper gives the details of a bloody transaction that occurred between a drove of negroes and their drivers about 8 miles from the above village, in the state of Kentucky. It appears that the negroes, 60 in number, were chained and hand-cuffed in the usual manner of driving these poor wretches, and that by the aid of a file, they succeeded in separating the irons which bound them in such way as to be able to throw them off at any moment. In the course of the journey two of the slaves dropped their shackles and commenced a fight, when the wagoner, Petit, rushed in with his whip to compel them to desist. At this moment every negro was found perfectly at liberty, and one of them seizing a club gave Petit a violent blow on the head and laid him dead at his feet. Allen, who came to his assistance, met a similar fate from the contents of a pistol fired by another of the gang. Gordon was then attacked, seized and held by one of the negroes, while another fired twice at him with a pistol, the ball of which each time grazed his head, but not proving effectual, he was beaten with clubs and left for dead. They then commenced pillaging the wagon, and, with an axe, split open the trunk of Gordon. and rifled it of the money, about \$2,400. Sixteen of the negroes then took to the woods. Gordon in the mean time, not being materially injured, was enabled, by the assistance of one of the women, to mount his horse and flee; pursued, however, by one of the gang, on another horse, with a pistol. Fortunately, he escaped with his life, barely arriving at a plantation as the negro came in sight, who then turned about and retreated. The neighborhood was immediately rallied, and a hot pursuit given, which we understand has resulted in the capture of the whole gang, and the recovery of the greater part of the money.—*Niles' Register*, Sept. 5, 1829.

DOMESTIC SLAVE TRADE.—The schooner Lafayette, with a cargo of slaves, from Norfolk for New Orleans, narrowly escaped being captured by them on the voyage. They were subdued after considerable difficulty, and twenty-five of them were bolted down to the deck until the arrival of the vessel at New Orleans.—*Niles' Register*, January 9, 1830.

DOMESTIC SLAVE TRADE.—According to the New Orleans papers, there were imported into that port, during the week commencing on the 16th ult., from the

various ports of the United States, 371 slaves, principally from Virginia, as follows :—

By the Tribune	from Alexandria,	141
" Sarah	" Baltimore,	4
" United States	" Norfolk,	150
" James Ramsay	" Baltimore,	2
" Susan	" Charleston,	14
" Atlas	" do.	60

Total, - - - 371

Niles' Register, November 26, 1831.

— It is among the abominations that attend upon slavery, in which, in some cases, we fear that fathers have made a traffic in their own children as slaves! We well remember a conversation with Mr. CALHOUN when Secretary of War, in which he introduced the subject. He stated a case, in which the feelings of a large assembly had been much outraged by the exposure of a man placed on the stand for sale as a slave; whose appearance, he said, in all respects, gave him a better claim to the character of a *white man* than most persons so acknowledged could share; and he thereupon suggested that some regulation ought to be made, by which individuals so circumstanced, should be declared freemen.—*Niles' Register*, October 25, 1834.

OPINIONS AND TESTIMONY OF THOMAS JEFFERSON.

A friend has kindly put us in possession of a letter from Mr. JEFFERSON to Dr. PRICE, of London, for which we are exceedingly obliged. It was written more than half a century ago, while Mr. Jefferson was in France, and shows with authority, which few will dare to dispute, what was the state of public sentiment in the United States in regard to slavery at that time. By the help of this letter as a sure signal we may ascertain what progress we have made in respect to liberty. The letter may be found in Jefferson's *Posthumous Works*, Vol. I. page 268.

PARIS, AUG. 7th, 1785.

TO DR. PRICE.

SIR—Your favor of July 2d came duly to hand. The concern you therein express as to the effect of your pamphlet in America induces me to trouble you with some observations on that subject. From my acquaintance with that country I think I am able to judge with some degree of certainty of the manner in which it will have been received. Southward of the Chesapeake it will find but few readers concurring with it in sentiment on the subject of slavery. From the mouth to the head of the Chesapeake, the bulk of the people will approve it in theory, and it will find a respectable minority ready to adopt it in practice. A minority which for weight and worth of character preponderates against the greater number who have not the courage to divest their families of a property which however keeps their consciences uneasy. Northward of the Chesapeake you may find here and there an opponent to your doctrine, as you may find here and there

a robber and a murderer, but in no greater number. In that part of America there being but few slaves they can easily disencumber themselves of them and emancipation is put into such a train that in a few years there will be no slaves northward of Maryland. In Maryland I do not find such a disposition to begin the redress of this enormity as in Virginia. This is the next state to which we may turn our eyes for the interesting spectacle of justice in conflict with avarice and oppression, a conflict wherein the sacred side is gaining daily recruits from the influx into office of young men grown and growing up—these have sucked in the principles of liberty, as it were with their mothers' milk, and it is to them I look with anxiety to turn the fate of this question. Be not therefore discouraged, what you have written will do a great deal of good, and could you still trouble yourself with our welfare, no man is more able to give aid to the laboring side.—The college of William and Mary in Williamsburgh, since the remodeling of its plan is the place where are collected together all the young men of Virginia under preparation for public life. They are there under the direction (most of them) of a Mr. Wythe, one of the most virtuous of characters and whose sentiments on the subject of slavery are unequivocal. I am satisfied if you could resolve to address an exhortation to those young men with all that eloquence of which you are master—that its influence on the future decision of this important question would be great, perhaps decisive. Thus you see that so far from thinking you have cause to repent of what you have done, I wish you to do more, and wish it on an assurance of its effect. The information I have received from America of the reception of your pamphlet in the different states agrees with the expectation I had formed.

THOMAS JEFFERSON.

At what time during the last twenty years would one of our foreign ministers have dared to court "foreign interference" with our "domestic institutions?"—Let our maligners and the persecutors of George Thompson settle their account with THOMAS JEFFERSON. It is in the language of THOMAS JEFFERSON—one of the southern parties to the "compact"—that we say,—*Be not discouraged, GEORGE THOMPSON; your mission will do a great deal of good, and could you still trouble yourself with our welfare, no man is more able to give aid to the laboring side. So far from thinking you have cause to repent of what you have done, WE WISH YOU TO DO MORE.*—In saying this, are we traitors to our country? So was THOMAS JEFFERSON. In saying this do we violate the spirit of the great compromise? We were taught by THOMAS JEFFERSON.

Again, are we wrong in agitating the subject of slavery because slaveholders are opposed to such agitation? So were the great majority of them in 1785. Are we wrong in agitating the subject at the North, where there are none or very few slaves? Dr. Price was encouraged to write Anti-Slavery pamphlets, though he could find few readers at the South, and at the North emancipation was already in a train of accomplishment. At the North he had but here and there an opponent—few will pretend that our opponents at the North are as rare as "robbers and murderers."

Again, we are accused of being young ourselves, and of endeavoring to excite the young. It was to the young, too, that JEFFERSON looked "with anxiety to turn the fate of this question." Much as we revere age, and we trust no one more sincerely honors the hoary head, that is found in the way of wisdom, we have no faith in age, for reform. The mature generation cannot be expected to rebuke itself, nor mar its own hold on immortality. The great men of ripe years have built their reputation upon, and mixed up their interests with existing institutions. They cannot be expected to pull down the old, now that it is too late to build up

anew. We think that a certain poet was not far from the truth when he sang^d that

— grave and hoary men were bribed to tell,
 From seats where law is made the slave of wrong,
 How glorious Athens in her splendor fell,
 Because her sons were free—and that among
 Mankind, the many to the few belong,
 By Heaven, and Nature, and Necessity.
 They said, that *age was truth*, and that the *young*
 Marred with wild hopes *the peace of slavery*,
 With which old times and men had quelled the vain and free.

We are blamed for meddling with the colleges. The youth at our colleges, it is said, have nothing to do with slavery. All discussion of it interferes with the business of their education. Why should mere "boys" trouble their heads with grave matters of legislation—let them leave such things to their fathers. Instructors, too, are blamed if they venture to express unequivocal opinions in regard to slavery. It is traveling beyond their calling.—THOMAS JEFFERSON, in 1785, had other views on these points. He looked, as we do, to the young men of our colleges as the nation's hope, and wished to have them *exhorted with all possible eloquence*, with a view to their action on the decision of this important question. The hopes of Jefferson will yet be realized, though during his life time they waned exceedingly, as is evident from the following letter to Governor Cole of Illinois.

MONTICELLO, AUG. 25, 1814.

DEAR SIR,—Your favor of July 31st was duly received, and was read with peculiar pleasure. The sentiments breathed through the whole do honor to both the head and heart of the writer. Mine, on the subject of the slavery of negroes, have long since been in possession of the public, and time has only served to give them stronger root. The love of justice and the love of country plead equally the cause of these people and it is a moral reproach to us that they should have pleaded it so long in vain, and should have produced not a single effort,—nay, I fear, not much serious willingness to relieve them and ourselves from our present condition of moral and political reprobation.—From those of the former generation, who were in the fullness of age when I came into public life, which was while our controversy with England was on paper only, I soon saw that nothing was to be hoped. Nursed and educated in the daily habit of seeing the degraded condition, both bodily and mental, of those unfortunate beings, but not reflecting that that degradation was very much the work of themselves and their fathers, few minds have yet doubted but that they were as legitimate subjects of property as their horses or cattle. The quiet and monotonous course of colonial life had been disturbed by no alarm, and little reflection on the value of liberty. And when an alarm was taken at an enterprise of their own, it was not easy to carry them to the whole length of the principles which they invoked for themselves. In the first or second session of the legislature, after I became a member, I drew to this subject the attention of Colonel Bland, one of the oldest, ablest, and most respected members, and he undertook to move for certain moderate extensions of the protection of the laws to these people. I seconded his motion, and as a younger member, was more spared in the debate; but he was denounced as an enemy to his country, and was treated with the greatest indecorum. From an early stage of our Revolution, other and more distant duties were assigned to me; so that from that time till my return from Europe in 1789, and, I may say, till I returned to reside at home in 1809, I had little opportunity of knowing the progress of public sentiment here on this subject. I had always hoped that the *younger generation*,

receiving their early impressions after the flame of liberty had been kindled in every breast, and had become as it were the vital spirit of every American, in the generous temperament of youth, analagous to the motion of their blood, and above the suggestions of avarice, would have sympathised with oppression wherever found, and proved their love of liberty beyond their own share of it. But my intercourse with them, since my return, has not been sufficient to ascertain that they have made towards this point the progress I had hoped.—Your solitary, but welcome voice, is the first which has brought this sound to my ear; and I have considered the general silence which prevails on this subject as indicating an apathy unfavorable to every hope. Yet the hour of emancipation is advancing in the march of time.

I am sensible of the partialitie with which you have looked towards me as the person who should undertake this salutary but arduous work. But this, my dear sir, is like bidding old Priam to buckle the armor of Hector "*tremantibus aevum humeris, et inutile ferrum cingi.*" No: I have overlived the generation with which mutual labors and perils begat mutual confidence and influence. This enterprise is for the *young*; for those who can follow it up, and bear it through to its consummation. It shall have all my prayers; and these are the only weapons of an old man.

It is an encouraging observation, that no good measure was ever proposed which, if duly pursued, failed to prevail in the end. We have proof of this in the history of the endeavors in the British Parliament to suppress that very trade which brought this evil on us. And you will be supported by the religious precept, "be not weary in well doing." That your success may be as speedy and complete, as it will be honorable and immortal consolation to yourself, I shall as fervently and sincerely pray as I assure you of my great friendship and respect.

THOMAS JEFFERSON.

EDWARD COLE, Esq.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

FRENCH SOCIETY FOR THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY.

From a report which gives the proceedings of this society down to the 10th of August, 1836, we are enabled to quote some particulars which may be interesting to our readers. The society was formed in 1834, and embraces among its members men of high political importance. Its officers are:—

PRESIDENT.

The duke de BROGLIE, peer of France.

Vice Presidents.

M. PASSY, minister of commerce and public works.

M. ODILLON BARROT, member of the chamber of deputies.

Secretaries.

M. COUNT ALEXANDER DELAORDE, *aide-de-camp* of the king, member of the Institute, &c.

M. ISAMBERT, counsellor of the court of cassation, and member of the chamber of deputies.

Treasurer.

M. A. THAYER, banker, Rue de Menars, Paris.

The following articles are extracted from the "statutes" of the society.

1. The object of the society's labors is to invoke the application of all those measures which tend towards the emancipation of the slaves in our colonies, and at the same time to seek the most prompt and effectual means to ameliorate the condition of the colored class, to enlighten their minds, and to make their liberty useful and profitable to all the inhabitants of the colonies.

2. The society is composed of twenty seven founding members, and of an unlimited number of associated members.

3. The candidate for admission to the society must be presented by two of its members, and proposed at the following sitting, by the central committee.

It is also necessary to pay an annual subscription, of which the amount is optional, but which cannot be less than 25 francs for each member.

4. All the members of the society have the right to be present at its sittings and take part in its deliberations.

5. The founding members form a central committee. This committee has power to elect on committees for the direction of the society's labors such associate members as are distinguished for their labors, and these members shall enjoy the same rights as the founders.

6. The central committee shall render account of its labors at the general and public meetings.

7. The amount of subscription, after defraying incidental expenses, is devoted to publications, and to the collecting of documents which can throw light upon the question of the enfranchisement of the slaves.

8. The treasurer of the society shall render an account of his administration quarterly.

Addition, June 1st, 1835.—The society admits corresponding members in the departments, with a voluntary payment which is to be addressed to the treasurer.

The report of the society's operations is arranged in the form of minutes of its sittings. From these minutes we make a few extracts.

JANUARY 11th (1836).—M. Passy, one of the vice presidents, announced that in concert with M. de Tracy, he had drawn up the *project* of a proposition to the chamber, it consisted of three parts.

By the first, slavery would be abolished on the first of January, 1840.

By the second, royal ordinances would provide the necessary measures to prepare the people of the colonies.

By the third and last, certain financial measures would be proposed to the chambers, in the session of 1839, to effect the liberation.

FEBRUARY, 15th.—It appears by documents received from French Guiana, that the decree of the convention for the abolition of slavery in 1794, did not cause any disturbances, but that it impaired industry, because it was published alone, without any measure relative to the cultivation of the estates. Slavery was again established there by order of the consular government, by a proclamation of Victor Hugo, of the 5th Floreal, year XI.

At the time of this re-establishment, *the colony exported more products than in 1789, with a considerably smaller number of laborers.* The colonists were free from their old debts. Most of the actual fortunes date from this epoch. The re-establishment of slavery, therefore, is to be considered as a useless and impolitic measure; after eight years of the enjoyment of liberty, there was resistance; five or six hundred blacks lost their lives in the struggle.

FEBRUARY, 28th.—In the sitting of the chamber of deputies, of the 9th of March, (1836), M. admiral Duperré, upon the interrogation of M. Roger du Loiret, a member of the society, said that in imitation of the president of the council, "the government was occupied in collecting all the facts which could throw light upon the important question of emancipation."

After the session, he continued, I shall lose no time in addressing to the governors of our colonies, a note which indeed I have already communicated to the colonial delegates, that they might have it to submit to the colonial councils, and enjoin upon them to consider it. Consequently, the colonial councils are at this

moment possessed of the note which I have sent them. It is at this present session of 1836 that they will be occupied with it. The results will be forwarded to me, and the government will take measures accordingly; but on account of the great distance, the chamber will see the necessity of giving time.

The department of the marine, for its part, is spontaneously occupied with all the means of ameliorating the condition of the slaves; it has also sought by the provisions of a law which is already drawn up, to augment the number of enfranchisements in yielding to the slave the power to liberate himself, either by means of ransom, creating for this purpose a peculium of which he is assured the legal possession, or by other means, for example, requiring that every slave who quits the colony to accompany his master shall be freed before his departure. He added that the government would neglect no means of promoting religious and moral education, so as to advance the civilization of this class of the population. He thought this the best way to insure to them, as well as to all, the peaceable enjoyment of the boon which would one day be granted them.

MARCH 21st.—The society heard a statement from M. Ramon de la Sagra, for a long time Director of the Botanic Garden at Havannah. He employed only emancipated blacks, who had gone through an apprenticeship of five years; he was perfectly satisfied with them; their number is from four to five thousand. They work for hire. There will not be in this island (Cuba) very great obstacles to emancipation, inasmuch as the prejudice, so to speak, does not there exist. Children found or left destitute, who are fully black or mulattoes, are placed in the hospitals, under the protection of the king, and by virtue of this are considered noble, as well as the whites; they are admissible, and, in fact, admitted to all employments, for which they have the necessary knowledge.

APRIL 11th.—Since the ordinance of 1832, in regard to enfranchisements, among 20,000 claims of liberty in Martinique, there have been but 20 objected to; among these objections, there has been but one put in by creditors; all the objections have been declared ill founded.

MAY 9th.—A member proposed to petition for partial and successive emancipation, commencing by the enfranchisement of the children without indemnity.

The society thought that it ought to hold on to the principle of general abolition. The Chamber of Deputies and the government, are but too much disposed to avoid the financial difficulties of the question by adopting such means. Besides, a partial emancipation, to say nothing of its injustice, would not prevent the dangers which are apprehended, and would be more injurious to the colonies.

JUNE 6th.—The secretary gave an account of an interview, which he had had with the director of the administration of the colonies, in consequence of the discussion in the chambers.

He inquired what was the disposition of the administration since the discussion. He was answered that it was sincerely abolitionist; but that under this name it had been already vigorously attacked by the colonial party.

How long time will the administration require to carry its abolition designs into execution? Answer. *Three years.*

More than this, the director is not a partizan of the English system. The apprenticeship, he says, is useless. The experience of it has taught that it needs rigorous rules to insure the continuance of labor. This will make a slavery almost as cruel as the old.

Besides, it will be necessary to consult the interests of the treasury. France will never consent to give 200 millions to the colonies to ransom 260,000 slaves.

The director grants that the two ordinances published in the month of May, however useful, are no step towards emancipation. From this time to the next session of the chambers, the minister will prepare measures more efficacious. M. the director, has also promised to publish an analysis of the votes of the colonial councils.

A member complained of the little aid which the society obtained from the Catholic clergy.

As to the Protestants, M. Guizot, has pronounced a remarkable discourse as president of the Bible Society, at its sitting on the 20th April, 1836. In this dis-

course, published in the *Moniteur* of the 30th May, the ex-minister has said, "that religion has for its essential object the soul of man, not the soul in a general and abstract manner, but the soul of every man; the soul of every living and immortal being."

"The most of the ameliorations effected among us, he added, for the last 50 years, have had for their object the social condition, the relations of men to each other. Amidst so many projects, the soul of man itself has often been forgotten."

"This love of humanity, which has so much honored our times, has given place to a shuddering timidity; there must be more devotedness, more ambition for this great and holy cause."

It is to be regretted that a civilian in so high a place, has not up to the present time, uttered a single word, nor taken any part whatever in labors which have for their object to ransom the souls of our 260,000 blacks and their posterity; these people are not taught to understand any moral duty; they live and die like brutes.

A NATION'S BROKEN VOW.—On the 20th of October, 1774, the delegates of twelve colonies being assembled in Congress, in Philadelphia, for the purpose of obtaining relief from British oppression, entered *unanimously* into a solemn agreement binding upon themselves and their constituents, which with their names was placed on record before God and the world. The second article of this instrument was as follows:—

"WE WILL NEITHER IMPORT NOR PURCHASE ANY SLAVE IMPORTED AFTER THE FIRST DAY OF DECEMBER NEXT, AFTER WHICH TIME WE WILL WHOLLY DISCONTINUE THE SLAVE TRADE, AND WILL NEITHER BE CONCERNED IN IT OURSELVES, NOR WILL WE HIRE OUR VESSELS, NOR SELL OUR COMMODITIES OR MANUFACTURES TO THOSE WHO ARE CONCERNED IN IT."

Agreeably to this vow, the several states shut their ports against the foreign slave trade. Mr. Walsh, in his "Appeal," says Virginia formally abolished the trade in October, 1778, and the other states followed her example, at different times, before the date of the Federal Constitution. South Carolina, in 1803, was the first to break the vow, by a small majority of her legislature; and she plead the "provisions of the Constitution." Congress prohibited the traffic in Louisiana, in 1804. In 1805 the prohibition was repealed,—from that time to December 31st, 1807, the trade flourished horribly. 39,075 slaves were imported into Charleston alone; 8,688 of these were torn from Africa by the human-flesh-brokers of *New England*!

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS, BRIEFLY.—The President's message of December, 1835, accused the American Anti-Slavery Society, of issuing insurrectionary publications. The society threw open its doors, and invited the President, by a congressional committee, to examine *all its doings and publications*. The President made no reply. His message of December 1836—is silent.

Last year the Governor of South Carolina would have abolitionists "hanged without benefit of clergy"—would dissolve the union if Anti-Slavery Societies were not suppressed. This year he would have a "solemn declaration" asserting the *right* to recede, in case slavery be abolished in the District of Columbia. Last year slavery was his "corner stone, &c." This year it is his reason for not provoking foreign wars.

Last year the governor of New York thought abolitionism was dying. This year he is sure of it. Ecce signa—Gov. Ritner.—Vermont resolutions—chop-fallen mobocrats in Utica. Mr. Birney's *new press* in Cincinnati.—Abolitionists in Congress—increased number of lecturers. Anti-Slavery Societies doubled.

Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine.

No. VII.—For April, 1837.

By what magic is it that our great men have agreed together to make fools of themselves? It is not difficult to conceive how a southern slave might mistake for a pass an open letter, requesting the first person he should meet to give him a sound flogging; but it would be a rare piece of stupidity, even for him, after once getting the lashes well laid on, to persevere in using his unlucky paper for a *pass*. Such doltishness, however, is wisdom itself compared with the conduct of our great men in Church and State. They have the more than slavish—more than asinine stupidity, to carry about with them open letters recommending every honest man to consider and treat them as a set of hypocritical villains; and yet they gravely pretend, as if no body could interpret but themselves, that these letters are passes or orders, authorizing them to go to certain people, and commit certain robberies. Flogged ever so often—their passes hold good.

The papers to which we refer are the Constitution of the country and the Holy Bible, according to both of which the taking of *liberty* without due process of law, stands in the highest class of villany.

Well, here are our reverend Doctors of Divinity, with the morals, and consciences, and eternal destinies of the nation in their keeping, who in one breath preach from the Bible that it's "a mortal sin to *steal* a pin," and, in the next, appeal to the same Bible to show that *stealing a man or a woman* is no sin at all! Are they really unable to read their *pass*, or do they think we are?—or, do they think

posterity will not read it? Surely, if these Divines are resolved to go on advocating and practicing wholesale robbery, the sooner they fling away their Bibles the fewer floggings they will get.

And here is a successful politician—a pure democrat, an “equal rights” man—who has aimed at the high dignity of being the whole people’s head-servant—whence we, one of the people who placed him where he is, claim the right to speak freely of his movements. In his first step, if he has not made a fool of himself, he has suffered others to do it. On the Holy Bible which forbids all oppression and fraud, does he swear to administer according to a Constitution which ordains that no person shall be deprived of LIBERTY without *due process of law*. With these two *passes* he sets out, and the first piece of service he does the people is to tell them that it was very “wise” in our forefathers to violate the Constitution in a million or two of cases, and be silent about it!—He means to do as they did, &c. To say nothing about votes, posterity has rods in pickle, and the sooner such politicians get rid of the Constitution, the sooner they will be rid of a recommendation that these rods be applied to their own backs. Let them take our advice, and hereafter put a coffle-chain in the place of the sacred book, and on it swear to support the “corner stone” of our republican institutions, according to the views of George McDuffie. It is a wise thing for a fellow who is determined on a piece of villany, to have papers which will not go against him on trial. None of the patriarchs, before Calhoun and McDuffie, gave the genuine *pass* to the pockets of the laboring people.

THE
QUARTERLY
ANTI-SLAVERY MAGAZINE.

VOL. II.

APRIL, 1837.

NO. 3.

SLAVERY, AND THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

BY REV. SAMUEL CROTHERS, PASTOR OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, GREENFIELD,
OHIO.

(Continued from page 133.)

An examination of the Scripture proof that "the Mosaic institutions recognize the lawfulness of slavery," in a pamphlet entitled "*View of the subject of Slavery contained in the Biblical Repertory, for April, 1836, in which the Scripture argument it is believed, is very clearly and justly exhibited.*" Pittsburgh, 1836. *For gratuitous distribution.*"

A SLAVE is one who is bought, sold, or held as property. This feature of slavery is recognized by the laws of all our American slave states. According to a law of South Carolina, "slaves shall be deemed, sold, taken and reputed to be chattels personal, in the hands of their owners and possessors, their administrators and assigns, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever." (See Stroud.)

In the paragraph under review, we have three texts to prove that "slavery was tolerated among the ancient people of God;" and in a note a number of texts "on the manner in which slaves were acquired," and as to "the manner in which they were to be treated."

1. Let us examine the proof that "slavery was tolerated among the ancient people of God." *The first is*, "Abraham had servants in his family bought with money." Gen. xvii. 13. Here we have the monstrous assertion that the term *servant* necessarily means a *slave*. This is assumed by all who undertake to justify slaveholding from the Scriptures. Professor Hodge, in his Commentary on the Romans, informs us that the word *servant* is, in Greek, a

slave. And with frightful consistency, he assures us that the phrase, (Rom. vi. 22,) "*Become servants to God,*" ought to be, *become slaves to God!* To keep the South in good spirits, we must believe not only that Abraham kept slaves, but that our blessed Saviour was a slaveholder! Of course heaven must be, on a larger scale, like one of those establishments which line the shores of the Mississippi. When they find a text which recognizes *masters* or *servants*, they consider it triumphant.

First. It will prove that every country in Christendom is a slave region. On every farm in Great Britain there are *servants*. Every statute and every instrument of writing which obligates *tenants*, and *keepers of cattle*, &c., calls them *servants*, and their landlord or employer master. Is Great Britain a slave region? And in our own country every white apprentice is, in his indenture, called a *servant*. Is he a slave?

Second. It will prove that slavery is the *only* kind of servitude which the Scriptures approve. At one "fell swoop," it would unchurch the professors at Princeton, and every master and servant in our free states. If the term *servant*, of itself, and necessarily, signifies a *slave*, it follows not only that the kingdom of God has always been like the kingdom of the devil, in regard to servitude and personal rights, but that voluntary and requited servitude is a modern innovation, for which there is neither precedent nor example in Holy Writ; and therefore it is at least doubtful whether a voluntary servant and the master, who pays him wages, ought to be received into the Church. For if inspired men always passed them by unnoticed—if those whom they instruct and recognize as believers were slaves and slavemasters exclusively, where shall we find example for admitting the voluntary servant and his master, till they qualify themselves by slavery? Thus the assumption in question leads to the conclusion, not that God tolerated slavery, but that he tolerated nothing else.

On the other hand, to assume that the term *servant* never means a slave would be equally absurd. It would suppose that either there were no slaves in the neighborhood of the Church, or that the inspired writers never had occasion to speak of them—either of which would be contrary to fact.

The same word (obed) properly rendered a *servant*, (and sometimes very improperly translated *bondmen* and *bondservant*) is the term used to express either a *servant* or a *slave*.

Here the important inquiry arises, How shall we know *when* the term *servant* means a *servant* in the good sense, and when it means a *slave*? The rule is simple, and easily applied. *When it is used in reference to one in the Church or kingdom of God, under his law of love, it means one who labors voluntarily for wages; but when it is used in reference to the kingdom of Satan, where the law of love has no place it means a slave.* The fact that the law of Moses uses the word *servant* only; and that there was no necessity for one which of itself means a *slave*, is important. It shows that both slaves and servants never were allowed in God's kingdom. The history of our own country illustrates this matter.

In one half of our states we have slaves, in the other servants only. The consequence is, many persons have ceased to use the term *slaves*, both in writing and conversation. It is not necessary. When we hear of the *servants in Virginia*, and the *servants in Pennsylvania*, every body understands it. But a little more than half a century since it was otherwise. In Virginia, besides slaves, there were also servants—poor men from Germany and Britain, who, to pay their passage across the ocean, and procure something to commence business with, had sold themselves for a term of years, for what they considered a fair compensation for their services. In the meantime both slavery and servitude existed in Pennsylvania. In this state of things there was necessity for the term *slaves*, as well as *servants*. No two neighbors could understand each other without them both. But slavery, (as it does in every country where it exists,) soon banished voluntary servitude from Virginia and other states, principally by making it disreputable. In the mean time, through the labors of such Abolitionists as Dr. Franklin, slavery was banished from Pennsylvania and some other states. The result was, the word *slave* began to be laid aside. It now creates no difficulty or confusion to hear of the *servants* in any part of the Union provided we know to what state the speaker has reference.

So it was in the Holy Land, and the region round about. There were but two kingdoms—the kingdom of God, including the house of Israel in the Holy Land, and the kingdom of Satan, embracing all the heathen nations on earth. These kingdoms were separated by a line more deep and broad than that which separates Ohio and Kentucky. On one side God was the chief magistrate; on the other the prince of darkness. The principles and laws by which these kingdoms were governed were as unlike and opposite as heaven and hell. Where inspired writers, therefore, speak of *servants*, there is no difficulty in understanding them, provided we know to which of these kingdoms they have reference.

We shall illustrate this by disposing of one of the texts quoted, “as to the manner of treating slaves.” It is Exod. xx. 10, where the Lord, in the fourth commandment, forbids masters to require or permit their servants to profane the Sabbath. Let us place by the side of it Deut. xxiii. 15, where Israelites are required to protect every servant escaping to them from his master. The man whom the Lord allows an Israelite to hold is (obed) *a servant*; so is the man, escaping from his master, whom the nation is to protect at all hazards. From the mere fact that the one is in the kingdom of God, under a law framed in heaven, and calculated to promote his present and eternal happiness, we know that he is a servant laboring voluntarily for a man who is bound to give him just wages. Here God approves the relation. But from the mere fact that the other is from the devil, where present rights are disregarded, and where the regulations of servitude are as wicked as devils and bad men would have them, we know that he was a slave. Hence the nation is required to protect him. The same God who required them to restore to an enemy a stray ox or an ass (Exod. xxiii. 4,) forbade them to restore a runaway slave. An ox or ass is lawful property. But to hold a man as property is a damning sin; and Israel must not wink at it, though it should involve them in war with their slaveholding neighbors.*

* A man found guilty of assisting a slaveholder to catch a runaway, or refusing to assist him to escape from his master, would have been excommunicated from the Jewish Church. The same man, remaining impenitent, will be excluded from the Christian Church, just as soon as “the Mosaic institutions are recognized as in harmony with eternal principles.”

Were we to hear from such Biblical scholars as some of our southern governors that in the word servant there is sufficient proof that the Holy Land was a slave region; and that the fourth commandment requires and regulates slavery, we could bear it. But woe worth the day! is this the Biblical instruction which our youth are drinking in at Princeton?

But we are told—Abraham *bought* his servants. True; and in no other way can a man lawfully become the master of servants—all that has been said about the “*five ways*” to the contrary notwithstanding. Many good men have bought servants, who for “all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them,” would not be concerned in the sale or purchase of a slave.

Here again another absurd principle is assumed, viz:—that *buying a man*, necessarily means, not buying him of himself as Jacob was bought by Laban, or as Joseph bought the Egyptians for servants to Pharaoh, but buying him of some third person as Potiphar bought Joseph of the Ishmaelites. Even if this were true, it would not lead to the conclusion that God tolerated slavery; but to the tremendous conclusion that slavery is the only kind of servitude for which there is example in the Bible. Of course those farmers who used to buy *servants* from Europe, sinned against God and their neighbor. But slave-buyers in the south are sustained by the example of the purest men in the Old Testament church.

He must be remarkably unacquainted with his Bible, who does not know that buying a man sometimes means, securing a right to his services for a limited time by paying him a price; and sometimes it means buying him of some neighbor who claims the right to dispose of him as property. In other words, sometimes it means buying a servant in the good sense of the term; and sometimes it means buying a slave. And the meaning of the phrase is always to be determined by the simple question, *Who sold him?* In this way we decide whether buying any thing is right. We are told in the book of Psalms that *Jacob served*; and that *Joseph was sold for a servant*. They were both bought, and they both served. It was not necessary to tell us which was a *servant*, and which the *slave*; for we all know that Jacob sold himself; and Joseph was sold by others without

his consent. To buy corn of its lawful owners is right. But to buy it of thieves is to partake with them in the guilt of stealing. Jacob sent his sons into Egypt to *buy corn*. His character and the fact that God approved it rebukes the insinuation that he sent his children to trade with thieves. Abraham bought the services of men and women; and the advocates of slavery take it for granted that he did not buy them of themselves, and that God approved it. How does it come that Jacob and Abraham fare so differently? Happily for Jacob, we have no legalized system of cornstealing, for the defence of which it is necessary to sacrifice his character. But unhappily for Abraham, we have a system of manstealing which cannot be sustained without libels on his character, and the character of the God whom he served.

There are two ways of buying servants. Let us look at them, and see which comports best with the revealed will of the Holy One.

1. They are sometimes bought of some neighbor who for a certain sum gives the purchaser a license to make them work without wages. Thus they are bought on the coast of Guinea, and all those dark regions where devil worship prevails. Thus Potiphar obtained his Hebrew slave. And God has recorded that *he was stolen*; and when he gave his law by Moses, he required that every manstealer should be put to death.

2. Servants are sometimes bought by paying them what they consider a fair compensation for their services, and taking their obligation to serve for a limited term. In this way Jacob, and the Egyptians were bought; and this is *the way* contemplated by the law of Moses. Hence we hear incidentally the phrase, *If thy brother wax poor and sell himself*, Lev. xxv. 47. This way of buying servants has this great convenience—there is no fraud, no injustice, no cruelty, no oppression connected with it. All parties are pleased; all *are partakers of the benefit*. It is a transaction which the purest mind in the universe can contemplate with pleasure.

We have two questions to ask the author of the article in the Repertory. Which of these ways does the devil most approve? Your knowledge of the elevation of *that wicked one*, and of the whole history of his reign, compels you to say *the first*. Again—which of these ways comports best

with the character of your Heavenly Father? But you have answered this inquiry already. The very design of the article in the Biblical Repertory was to rebuke the Abolitionists for saying that God's way and the devil's way of buying servants are not the same. And thus you have paid the devil the highest compliment ever paid him, by any good man, since the world began. It has been suggested as an apology, that this was not the necessary result of your views of the character and will of the Most High—but to save the seminary from the storm which the father of mischief and sin has raised against the Abolitionists. It may be so. And it reminds us of the answer of a poor Indian when asked why he prayed to the bad spirit, and not to the good. He replied, that he was afraid of the bad spirit, and wished to keep him in a good humor by saying his prayers to him. This course is likely to become fashionable. The enemy of souls lately raised a mob to pull down a college and theological seminary in Missouri, on suspicion that the professors were opposed to slavery. The president to quiet the blaspheming wretches, stepped forward and assured them that he had bought one slave, and expected to buy more. And they dispersed with a shout of approbation, like that with which their master was cheered when he proposed the ruin and enslavement of the human race. Quere—How long will a devil's blessing give prosperity to our public institutions?

A servant bought with money, means *a servant* in the good sense. It never did mean any thing else in any land, or in any age, excepting where the morals and the mind of the community were polluted by slavery. A large proportion of the households in Pennsylvania used to be servants of this description. When "the good man of the house" was inquired for, the answer frequently was, "He is gone to Philadelphia to buy servants from Scotland or Ireland." Many of these servants, by industry and economy after their term expired, became wealthy. We could name some of their sons who are slaveholders. These sons are zealous advocates for holding slaves. Their proof is, *Abraham had servants bought with money*. Were you to remind them that their fathers were bought with money, and therefore their children must be the sons of slaves, your life would be in danger. They would lynch or dirk you for

believing that *a servant bought with money* means slave.

Abraham's servants were pious—hence they were to be circumcised. They were the souls whom he, and Sarah, and Lot had *gotten* (Heb. *made*) in *Haran*. Gen. xii. 5, i. e., they were the proselytes they had made—so the phrase was understood before the slave trade commenced. They followed him because he was *a mighty prince*, a prophet, and priest of the Most High God. They became his servants because they wanted employment, and he wanted servants. There were no slaves in Abraham's house when the angels visited him, Gen. xviii. A young man killed and dressed the calf, Sarah did all the baking, and Abraham all the waiting at the table. Where were his hundreds of servants? In their own tents, with their own families, ready, no doubt, to entertain strangers after the pious and hospitable example of their pastor.

[To be continued.]

SLAVERY AND THE CONSTITUTION.

BY REV. SAMUEL J. MAY.

[Concluded from page 90.]

IN the October number of this Magazine we gave what we believe to be a correct exposition of those parts of the Constitution, under which the abettors of slavery attempt to shelter that most atrocious system of outrage upon human rights. We hope we made it apparent to our readers that the Magna Charta of our civil liberties was not intended to be, and is not, by any fair construction, instrumental to the continued oppression of the colored people of the land. So far from there being in the Constitution (as there is generally supposed to be) a guarantee of slavery, there cannot be found in it so much as an explicit recognition of its existence. It seems to us that the members of the Federal Convention are to be considered no more answerable for

the continuance of slavery in any of these United States, than for the continuance of lotteries, distilleries or brothels. True, there are several articles in the Constitution framed with reference to the slave system existing in some of the States. But how are they framed? So as to countenance and encourage the abomination? By no means. Far otherwise, as we have shown in the former part of this disquisition. They are so framed that they may remain unchanged after slavery shall be abolished. Indeed we see not, if there were no slaves in the land, how any or any part of these articles could be spared, excepting only the words *three-fifths of all other persons* in Art. I., Sec. I. And it surely would not be worth while to be at any great trouble to procure the amendment of the Constitution by the erasure of these words. They might be suffered to remain, as the IX. Sec. of Art. I. has remained ever since 1808—a dead letter. As to the other passages, upon which so much reliance is placed by those who would have it believed that slavery is upheld by our Constitution, Art. IV., Sec. III. C. 3, and Sec. IV. Any one may see at a glance, that if these should be erased, others of precisely the same import would need to be substituted for them.*

The more we have studied their work, the more plainly has appeared to us the especial pains which the framers of our Constitution took, so to construct those parts of it, in which there were necessarily references to the dissimilar population of the several states, as to leave with each state all the responsibility of enforcing civil disabilities upon any portion of its people.† And moreover, as we shall presently take pains to show, they have secured to us several important means and facilities for effecting the abolition of slavery, and other great evils in the country, which we should not have had if these states had continued under the original confederation.

But before we pass to that part of our subject, let us call the attention of our readers to several facts highly important in this connection.

And first, let it be observed, that the Federal Convention instituted the general government of this republic, so that it recognizes as its constituents *all* in the several states who

* See October number, page 86.

† See page 85.

are therein admitted to the elective franchise, in its *lowest* application. (See Art. I., Sec. I., C. 1.) At that time, in several of the states, a white complexion was not one of the qualifications of voters; colored men were free men, electors; and the framers of the Constitution made no exception of them. That this was not unintentional is put beyond question by the well-known fact, that some of the southern members of the Convention urged that the exception of colored men should be made, and their proposal was rejected "by a respectable majority." We believe that majority looked forward in confident expectation of the time when there would be no slave in this republic, then so zealous for freedom; and when there would be no differences in the civil and political rights of the people, "founded upon so casual and trifling a distinction as the color of a man's skin." There was a spirit then abroad in our land which threatened to extirpate every vestige of oppression; and the men who devised the plan of our general government were careful not to throw any impediment in its way.

If our readers need any thing more to confirm them in the assurance that the framers of the Constitution had no such intention respecting slavery as is now generally attributed to them—that they had no thought of giving the countenance, much less the guaranty of the general government to such an outrageous system of injustice and cruelty—we say, if our readers need to be more fully persuaded of this, let them only consider the subsequent conduct of some of those men in reference to this very matter. In less than two years after they had acted as members of the Convention, several were zealously engaged in societies for the abolition of slavery—societies which proposed to proceed, and for a number of years did proceed upon the same plan, that has been adopted by the anti-slavery societies of the present day. They procured eloquent men to address the public upon this "delicate" and "exciting" subject. They published in papers and pamphlets of every size, for general circulation, some of the sentiments that are now denounced as incendiary and insane. They sent into the slaveholding states earnest appeals to the citizens thereof against the enslavement of their fellow men. They moreover petitioned Congress, and prayed "their hon-

orable bodies to step to the very verge of the power vested in them, for discouraging *every species* of traffic in the persons of our fellow men." In all these measures several of the framers of the Constitution heartily concurred—especially Benjamin Franklin, one of the last men in the world to misunderstand the letter or spirit of an instrument to which he had given the sanction of his name; or to disregard any of the provisions he had deliberately helped to make for promoting the welfare of the people of the United States. We will give an extract from a memorial to Congress, presented in February, 1790, about two years after the adoption of the Constitution, by Dr. Franklin as president, and in behalf of a society which embraced many of the most distinguished and venerated men of that day, and among them several who were members of the Federal Convention :—

"That mankind are all formed by the same Almighty Being, alike objects of his care, and equally designed for the enjoyment of happiness, the Christian religion teaches us to believe, and the political creed of Americans fully coincides with the position. Your memorialists, particularly engaged in attending to the distresses arising from slavery, believe it to be their *indispensable duty* to present this subject to your notice. They have observed with real satisfaction that many important and salutary powers are vested in you, 'for promoting the welfare and securing the blessings of liberty to the people of the United States;' and as they conceive that these blessings ought rightfully to be administered, *without distinction of color*, to all descriptions of people, so they indulge themselves in the pleasing expectation, that nothing which can be done for the relief of the unhappy objects of their care will be either omitted or delayed.

"From a persuasion that equal liberty was originally the portion, and is still the birth-right of all men; and influenced by the strong ties of humanity, and *the principles of their institution*, your memorialists conceive themselves bound to use all justifiable endeavors to loosen the bands of slavery, and promote a general enjoyment of the blessings of freedom. Under these impressions they earnestly entreat your serious attention to the subject of

slavery ; that you will be pleased to countenance the restoration of liberty to those unhappy men, who alone, in this land of freedom, are degraded into perpetual bondage, and who, amidst the general joy of surrounding freedom, are groaning in servile subjection ; that you will promote mercy and justice toward this distressed race, and that you *will step to the very verge of the power vested in you for discouraging every species of traffic in the persons of our fellow-men."*

(Signed,)

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, *President.*

The memorial, from which the above is extracted, was obviously written and presented by men, wholly unconscious that any restraint had been imposed upon the sympathy, they might feel for suffering fellow-beings any where, and of any complexion ; or, upon the free expression of their sentiments and feelings respecting slavery ; or, upon the full exertion of all the *moral power*, they could bring to bear against the abominable thing, either in the community at large, or in the councils of the nation. They seem to have understood the provisions of the Constitution very much as we do. They knew that that charter of our republic did not confer upon the general government the power to abolish slavery in the several states, but left it to be done by the legislatures of those states ; precisely as it left gambling, horse-racing, and many other public vices. Nor have abolitionists of the present day ever proceeded on the supposition, that Congress did possess the power in question. But we believe, and the memorialists of 1790 believed, that many important and salutary powers are vested in Congress, which, if rightfully exercised, may go far towards securing the blessings of liberty to the people of the United States *without distinction of color* ; and that the friends of liberty in Congress and out should urge that body to "step to the very verge of their power" to relieve the oppressed, and restore all men to the enjoyment of their birthright.

Let us now look carefully through the grossly misrepresented Constitution of our country, and see what are the powers vested in our general government, that may be brought to bear against the system of slavery ; and what other provisions there are, by which the friends of liberty

out of Congress are assisted to prosecute the great cause they have espoused.

And, first, we would point to the VIII Sec. of Art. I, where we read that Congress shall have power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states." Now no power of this kind could have been exercised under the old confederation. Each state alone was then authorized to forbid the prosecution of any kind of traffic within its limits. There was, therefore, in this respect, a great enlargement of the prerogative of the general government by the Constitution. It was so considered at the time, and the friends of humanity rejoiced, that now there was a power competent to the entire suppression, throughout the country, of a traffic the most horrid that has ever disgraced our earth. The members of the convention foresaw the application of this power to the African slave trade, else why did they insert a clause in the next section, providing that this power should not be so exercised prior to 1808. So soon as the time specified had expired, Congress, clothed with the authority it received from the Constitution, did come forward, and, affixing the blackest epithet to that trade, denounced against all who might thereafter engage in it, the severest punishment human hands can inflict. It was a glorious Act. The praise of it has resounded throughout the world; and still resounds, though the Act has proved lamentably ineffectual. We stop not again to inquire how the majority of that convention, which so carefully avoided giving any explicit support, or even countenance to the slave system, should have been brought peremptorily to defer that act of mercy, which they *evidently intended Congress should perform*. Who they were that voted for the prohibition in the IX Sec., or who, that silently consented to its becoming a part of the Constitution, we cannot ascertain. Probably there were in that venerable body, some wise and even humane men, who, like some of the same description in our day, saw what was right, and desired it should be done, but thought it not prudent to have it done immediately. But we must leave our exposition of their conduct, in this particular, as it is in the October number of this work, pages 82, 83 and 84. We wish not to screen from censure whatever they did that was wrong. We did not expect, nor endeavor to show, in the

former part of this disquisition, that the framers of our Constitution did all for the relief of the colored population, that justice and humanity demanded. We only insisted that they brought the states of this confederacy into no agreement to perpetuate the bondage of any portion of the people; and introduced not an article nor a particle into the frame of our general government, which is any hindrance to the enfranchisement to-day of all, who are in slavery. And our present expectation and endeavor is not to show that the Constitution conferred upon Congress *all* power over slavery in our republic. But we insist that it invested Congress with *some* powers, and guaranteed to the benevolent in the land the free and full exercise of *a* power, which, if exerted aright, will subvert the foundations of that burning mountain of crime and misery, which throws its threatening shadows over our whole country.

If it be right to understand the first clause of the passage we have quoted from the VIII Sect. of Art. I, ("Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations,") as it has ever been understood, and was understood by the framers of the Constitution themselves; if it be right to understand that, by this clause, the power was conferred on Congress to abolish the African slave trade, then the inference is inevitable, that, by the other clause, ("and among the several states,") an equal authority was conferred over the equally wicked traffic in human beings, which is now carried on between the several states. In 1819, during the pendency of "the Missouri question," a large meeting of the citizens of Boston appointed Daniel Webster, George Blake, Josiah Quincy, James T. Austin, and John Gallison,* a committee to prepare and present to Congress a memorial on the subject of slavery. They discharged well the duty assigned them. We have the document which they prepared and signed. And we are happy to quote from it the following passage most pertinent to our purpose:—"No person has ever doubted that the prohibition of the foreign slave trade was completely within the authority of Congress, since the year 1808. And why? Certainly, only because

* Mr. Gallison was a young man of transcendent excellence, who died in 1820, universally lamented. The other gentlemen of that committee are still alive. But where are they? Among the friends of the outraged slaves? We see them not! We hear not from them!! Are they dead while they live?

it is embraced in the regulation of *foreign commerce*; and, if so, it may, for the like reason, be prohibited since that period, *between the states*. Commerce in slaves, since the year 1808, being as much subject to the regulation of Congress as any other commerce, if it should see fit to enact that no slave should ever be sold from one state to another, it is not perceived how its constitutional right to make such provision could be questioned."

Here, then, according to the unavoidable construction of the passage—the construction put upon it by those who framed it, and must have known what they meant—the construction sanctioned in our day by the "great expounder" and other distinguished civilians, here, the Constitution has placed in the hands of Congress a mighty power, which, had it been applied, as in all consistency it should have been, at the same time to the domestic that it was to the foreign slave trade, ere this would have broken up effectually, entirely, in all its parts, the accursed system of merchandise in men. We should not have been called to lament in our day that, notwithstanding its legal abolition, the African trade is still carried on as largely as ever, and "with greater keenness, ferocity, and waste of life;" and that the American slave trade is increasing yearly in amount and in its circumstances of cruelty. Oh! had our general government done its duty then, exerted its undoubted authority with an equal hand in 1808, it would not have been told to the world in 1836, that, in the course of that year, 120,000 human beings have been exported from one state alone.* Let, then, the blame and the disgrace of the continued traffic in our fellow men, since 1808, rest where they belong; not with the members of the federal convention, but with the members of Congress and their constituents.

The power to abolish this trade between the several states, although it has lain dormant, is still vested in Congress; and may yet be exerted with great effect. For this we are indebted to the Constitution; no such authority having belonged to the general government, under the former confederation.

* "The Virginia Times states that intelligent men estimate the number of slaves exported from Virginia within the last twelve months, at 120,000. About 40,000 of these they say have been sold for about 24,000,000—the rest have been carried out of the state by planters who have removed."

We would next direct the attention of all, who may be interested in this examination, to the 17th clause of the same section, from which we have just quoted, where it reads—“The Congress shall have power to exercise *exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever*, over such district (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular states, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of government of the United States, &c.” No one can reasonably suppose the framers of the Constitution foresaw the importance, to which this article would attain, in its bearing upon the great question, which now agitates our country from its extremities to its centre. Still it seems to us if they had intended, as some would have it, to preclude any action of Congress subversive of slavery, that they would have used in this place less unlimited and peremptory terms; for although the position of the capital was not then determined, it was highly probable it would be located partly, if not wholly in the slave states. It is fair, we think, to presume that those able, careful, patient men duly considered this as well as every other part of the Constitution, and used the best words they could find to express precisely the authority they meant to confer. For we cannot be forced to believe, they would have consented, that the capital city of our Republic should be what it has become, the great market, exchange and thoroughfare of slave-dealers; and would have withheld from the general government the authority to expel such a disgrace and nuisance from its especial jurisdiction. No. We cannot believe this.

Whatever our opposers may wish, or imagine, and try to persuade others to believe the framers of the Constitution intended, here we have in their own language the result of their deliberations on this point. No words could have been more plain and determinate. “Congress shall have power to *exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever*.” The legislative authority conferred by this clause is unlimited over the whole District of Columbia. So soon therefore as Congress can be induced to enact a prohibition of slavery there it will be as much within its power of legislation to do so, as any other ordinary act of local policy.*

* Some there are, perhaps many, who suppose that Congress cannot interfere with this abomination, standing in all its hideousness within the very purlieus of the Capitol, because of some conditions which they have heard, or imagined the

As it happens—under existing circumstances—the authority conferred upon Congress, in that clause of the Constitution now before us, is of the highest consequence. Not being invested with any authority over the system of slavery in the several states, it can do nothing directly to abolish it in those states. But the clause, we are considering, makes it the imperative duty of our general government to hear the representations, which may be made to it of the slavery, and the slave trade within its own jurisdiction; to institute a thorough inquiry concerning these outrages upon humanity; to entertain a full and free discussion respecting them; and to enact such laws or devise such measures as shall tend to establish justice, in sure domestic tranquility and promote the general welfare. Thus it is enabled, nay required, to do indirectly, in effect, what it may not attempt to do by any direct action. For whatever may be said on the floor of Congress of the intrinsic wickedness of slaveholding, of its demoralizing influences, and its impoverishing tendency—as reasons why it should be abolished in the District—will apply with equal pertinency to it elsewhere. And thus, while laboring as they have a right to do, nay are bound to do, under the Constitution to accomplish the redemption of the 7000 in the District, the friends of impartial liberty in Congress, will be loosening the chains of the millions of our countrymen, who are elsewhere groaning under our republican despots. This the slaveholders and their abettors foresee, and they are greatly alarmed at it. Conscious that the system, they would uphold, cannot bear to be scrutinized, they try to prevent the eye of inquiry from being turned towards it; and are therefore furious in their

states of Virginia and Maryland prescribed, in the cession of the District. But the history of that transaction does not inform us of any such conditions. The only article in "the Act of cession," which prescribes any limitations to the possession thereby given of the District, or any limitations to the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress, is the following—"Provided that nothing herein contained, shall be construed to vest in the United States any right of property in the soil, or to affect the rights of individuals therein" (i. e. in the soil) "otherwise than the same shall or may be transferred by such individuals to the United States." (Burch's Digest, p. 214.) We have also the opinions of some of our ablest civilians, that it is within the power of Congress to control, regulate or abolish the institution of slavery in the District. Nor indeed do we see how it would have been *Constitutional* for Congress to have acceded to any such condition, as is supposed to have been prescribed, seeing the language of the Constitution is explicit and imperative on this point, that it "*shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever.*"—Fourth Annual Report of Mass. A. S. Society.

opposition to any movement in Congress regarding slavery in the District. They have even presumed to assert, that any action of the general government on the subject would be unconstitutional, because it may not do indirectly, what it has no power to do directly. This proposition has been received by a large portion of the people, as if it were self-evidently true. Yet nothing can be more false and absurd. Congress, in like manner, has no power to suppress or regulate the manufacture or sale of ardent spirits in our several states ; but who would therefore claim that Congress may not listen to complaints of the misery and crimes flowing from this source in the District of Columbia ; institute the most thorough investigation of the subject ; entertain a full and free discussion respecting it ; enact a law for the entire or partial, the immediate or gradual abolition of the rum trade within its jurisdiction ; and publish throughout the country, a detailed report of the facts and arguments which may have brought it to this decision ? Who would for a moment question the right of Congress to do all these things in the case supposed ? And yet obviously it could not do all these things without promoting the suppression of the rum trade in the several states ; and thus doing indirectly what it has no authority to do directly. Numerous other illustrations of this point might easily be given, if there were any need of them. But one will suffice. This is enough to show to every mind, not blinded by passion or fear, that the position our opposers have taken is utterly untenable. There can be no reasonable doubt, that slavery, because it exists in the District of Columbia, with all its abominations, is a subject, which may be, and must be, thoroughly examined and discussed in the councils of our nation. The violence and fury of the southern gentlemen have only increased the necessity for this. They outrage the right of petition and the liberty of speech ; and these sacred rights must be protected and maintained just where they have been assailed. Thus the discussion of slavery on the floor of Congress is as justifiable as it is inevitable.

So we see, that by this 17th clause of the VIIIth Section of the Ist Article of our Constitution, a wide door is opened through which a flood of light may be poured in upon the dark places of the South, and the way of duty and of safety

made plain before those, who are now sitting in the region and shadow of death.

Our readers, those of them to whom the subject of this disquisition may be wholly new, will not be more surprised than we have been to find so much in our Constitution, auspicious to the cause of our enslaved countrymen. Until we examined, we really supposed there was, (for every body said there was) in the formation of our general government something like a guaranty to the slave holders, that they should be undisturbed in their violations of human rights; should be left in quiet possession of the limbs, lives and liberties of millions of our fellow-men. But, as we think we have shown, we have found nothing of the kind; but on the contrary much that is favorable to the cause we have so much at heart.

If, however, we had found in the Constitution the worst article that has ever been attributed to it, we should not have despaired; for there is also in it the most ample and explicit provision for its own amendment. Every part of it was left by its framers subject to revision and improvement, whenever those who live under it may see cause to revise and improve it. There is not an article, section or clause, which may not with the sanction of the Constitution itself, be now altered or annulled, excepting only that one, which provides that each state shall be entitled to an equal suffrage in the Senate; and even that may be altered if the state will consent to an alteration. The Vth Article, to which we refer, is most explicit to this effect. And moreover all the means necessary in order to procure a redress of any grievances, that may exist in the land; or to accomplish any plans of improvement, either with or without an amendment of the Constitution, are secured to us, so long as the authority of the Constitution is respected. Freedom of speech and of the press, and the right peaceably to assemble for consultation, and remonstrance are guaranteed to all the citizens of this republic, as explicitly as possible. Congress—the highest power in the land, *is peremptorily forbidden in any way to abridge them.*

What more can we ask for? We are free to exert all the intellectual and moral powers we possess; and these *alone* are mighty, through God to the pulling down of all the strong holds of Satan. With these alone we purpose to com-

bat slavery ; and it must yield ! This system of abominations will be uprooted, overthrown, annihilated ! The fear and fury of its supporters are presages of our victory. They dare not commit their base cause to an honorable conflict with facts and arguments, in the fair field of free discussion. But come they must to this. They may vapor, and vaunt, and threaten and rave. But all this will be of no avail. The spirit of our Constitution, and the spirit of our age demand, that nothing should stand, which cannot stand on its own merits. They may secede from the Union, but this will give them no relief. They will be just as near to God, just as near to truth, just as near to the abolitionists. They must secede from the earth ; nay, they must dissolve the moral government of the universe, before they can escape the necessity of meeting openly and fairly the great question of liberty and slavery. They cannot avert the discussion, nor avert its issue, which must be fatal to slavery.

——— “guided by our country’s laws,
For truth, and right, and suffering man,
Be ours to strive in freedom’s cause
As Christians *may*—as freemen *can* !
Still pouring on unwilling ears,
That truth oppression only fears.”

IS SLAVERY FROM ABOVE OR FROM BENEATH?

“Every good gift, and every perfect gift, is from ABOVE, and cometh down from the FATHER OF LIGHTS.”

Outline of an inquiry into the genius of the Mosaic system, and the teachings of the Old Testament on the subject of human rights.

THE spirit of slavery never takes refuge in the Bible of its own accord. The horns of the altar are its last resort. It seizes them, if at all, only in desperation—rushing from the terror of the avenger’s arm. Like other unclean spirits, it hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest its deeds should be reproved. Goaded to madness in its conflicts

with common sense and natural justice, denied all quarter, and hunted from every covert, it breaks at last into the sacred enclosure, and courses up and down the Bible, seeking rest and finding none. THE LAW OF LOVE, streaming from every page, flashes around it an omnipresent anguish and despair. It shrinks from the hated light, and howls under the consuming touch, as the demoniacs recoiled from the Son of God and shrieked, "Torment us not."

At last it slinks among the shadows of the Mosaic system, and thinks to burrow out of sight among its types and symbols. Vain hope ! Its asylum is its sepulchre ; its city of refuge, the city of destruction. It rushes from light into the sun ; from heat, into devouring fire ; and, from the voice of God, into the thickest of His thunders.

DEFINITION.

If we would know whether the Bible is the charter or the death warrant of American slavery, we must first determine *just what slavery is*. In order to this, the *thing itself* must be separated from its appendages. A constituent element is one thing ; a relation another ; an appendage another. Relations and appendages presuppose and prove the existence of *other* things, of which there are relations and appendages. To regard those as *the things themselves* to which they are attached, or as constituent *parts* of those things, leads to endless fallacies. A great variety of human conditions, relations, and tenures, and some of them not only innocent in themselves, but indispensable to the social state, are often confounded with slavery ; and, thus, slaveholding comes to be regarded as quite harmless and even virtuous. We will specify some of the things which are often confounded with slavery.

1. **POLITICAL DISABILITIES.**—1. *Privation of suffrage.* Then *minors*, and, in some of the states, all, not *freeholders*, are slaves.

2. *Ineligibility to office.* Then all *females* are slaves.

3. *Taxation without representation.* Then three fourths of the people of Rhode Island are slaves, and *all* in the District of Columbia.

4. *Privation of one's oath in law.* Then the *free* colored people of Ohio are slaves, and, in most of the states, all disbelievers in a future retribution.

5. *Privation of trial by jury.* Then the thirty millions in France, and as many more in Germany are *slaves*.

6. *Being required to support a particular religion.* Then all the English are slaves, and all the people of Connecticut previous to 1816, and of Massachusetts previous to 1821.

7. *Cruelty and oppression.* Wives are often cruelly treated ; hired domestics are often oppressed ; but these are very different *forms* of oppression from slavery.

8. *Apprenticeship.* The rights and duties of master and apprentice are correlative and reciprocal. The master's obligation to the apprentice is the *tenure* of his claim upon him ; and the *claim* of the apprentice upon the master is inseparable from his *obligation* to the master. The doctrine of an *equivalent for value received*, is at the bottom of apprenticeship. The rights of the apprentice are secured and his interests are promoted equally with those of the master. Indeed the law of apprenticeship, while it is *just* to the master, is *benevolent* to the apprentice. Its main design is rather to benefit the apprentice than the master ; to *promote his* interests, while *guarding from injury* those of the master in doing it. The law secures to the master, from the apprentice, a mere legal compensation ; while it secures to the apprentice from the master both a legal compensation for value received, and, virtually, a *gratuity* in addition, inasmuch as the apprentice is of the two decidedly the *greatest* gainer. The law not only recognizes the *right* of the apprentice to a reward for his labor beyond his food, clothing, schooling, &c., but *appoints* the *wages* and *enforces* the payment. Further ; the master's claim covers only the *services* of the apprentice, and those only on the fulfillment of *specified conditions*. The apprentice's claim covers *equally* the services of the master. The master cannot hold the apprentice as property, nor the apprentice the master ; but *each* holds property in the *services* of the other, and BOTH EQUALLY. Is this slavery ?

9. *Filial subordination and parental claims.* Both are nature's dictates, springing out of human necessities, and indispensable not only to the highest good of the whole, but to the very existence of the social state ; their *design* the promotion of mutual interests and happiness ; and the *means*, those natural affections created by the relation of

parent and child, and binding them in one by irrepressible affinities; and, thus, while exciting each to discharge those offices incidental to the relation and called for by the circumstances of the other, they constitute a shield for mutual protection. The parent's legal claim on the services of his children, while minors, is surely a meagre equivalent for the care and toil expended on their infancy and rearing, to say nothing of the outlays for their support and education. This legal provision for the good of the *whole*, is, with the greater part of mankind, indispensable to such an existence of the family state, as would make it a blessing. The child, in helping his parents, helps himself—increases a common stock in which he has a share; while his most faithful services but feebly acknowledge a debt which money cannot cancel.

10. *Bondage for crime, or the claims of the government on criminals.* Must innocence be punished because guilt suffers penalties? True, the criminal works for the government without pay; and well he may. He owes the government. A century's work would not pay its drafts on him. No matter how long he works for it, he is a public *defaulter*, and will die so. Because laws make men pay their *debts*, shall those be forced to pay who *owe nothing*? Besides, the law makes no criminal **PROPERTY**. It restrains his liberty: it makes him pay something, a mere penny in the pound, of his debt to the government; but it does not make him a *chattel*. Test it. To own *property* is to own its *product*. Are children born of convicts in state prisons government property? Besides, can *property* be *guilty*? are *chattels* *punished*?

11. *Restrictions upon freedom.* Children are restrained by parents—wards by guardians—pupils by teachers—patients by physicians and nurses—corporations by charters, and legislators by constitutions. Embargoes, tariffs, quarantines, imposts, vetoes, and acts of incorporation *keep men from doing as they please*. Are these restrictions slavery? Restraints are the web of civilized society, warp and woof. If they are *slavery*, civilized society is a mammoth slave—a government of **LAW**, the *climax of slavery*, and its executive a *king* among slaveholders.

12. *Involuntary or compulsory service.* A juryman is impannelled *against his will*—and sit he *must*. A sheriff orders his posse—bystanders *must* turn in. Neither love

nor money can buy off the *compulsion*—men are *compelled* to remove nuisances, pay fines and taxes, support their families, and “turn to the right as the law directs,” however much *against their wills*. Are they *therefore* slaves? To confound slavery with *involuntary* service or servitude, as is often done, is absurd. Slavery is a *condition*. The slave’s *opinion* of that condition and his *feelings toward* it are one thing—the *condition* itself, the *object* of these feelings, is *another* thing—these feelings are not only *not* the condition itself *toward* which they are exercised, but they cannot alter the *nature* of that condition. Its *intrinsic character* is utterly unalterable by the feelings of the slave. Whether he *desire* or *detest* it, the *condition* remains the same. The slave’s *willingness* to be held as a slave is no palliation of his master’s guilt in thus holding him. Suppose the slave verily thinks himself a chattel, and consents that others shall regard him so, does that *make* him a chattel, or does that make those guiltless who *hold* him as *such*? I may be sick of life, and I tell the assassin so that stabs me, is he any the less a murderer because I *consent* to be made a corpse? Does my partnership in his guilt blot out his part of it?

If the slave were willing to be a slave, his *voluntariness* so far from *lessening* the guilt of his “owner” *aggravates* it. If slavery has so palsied the mind of the slave that he looks upon himself as an article of property, and *consents* to be one, actually *to hold him as such*, falls in with his delusion, and strengthens it, confirming as by an oath the impious falsehood. *These very convictions and feelings of the slave* (if such are possible) increase a hundred fold the guilt of the master in holding him as property, and call upon him in thunder, immediately to recognize him as a *man*, and thus break the delusion that spell-binds his soul, cheating it out of its birth-right, and blotting out the consciousness of its worth and destiny.

Many of the foregoing conditions and relations are *appendages* of slavery, and some of them inseparable from it. But no one, nor all of them together, constitute its *intrinsic unchanging element*.

We proceed to state affirmatively that,

ENSLAVING MEN IS REDUCING THEM TO ARTICLES OF PROPERTY, making free agents goods and chattels, converting

persons into things, sinking intelligence, accountability, immortality, and personal, inalienable ownership, into mere merchandise. A *slave* is one held in this condition. *Slavery* is the condition itself. *Slaveholding* is keeping men in this condition, subject to these liabilities, whether the holder *personally* regards the slave in this light, or not. *Slavedealing* is trafficking in HUMAN WARE. A slave is a mere *tool* for another's use and benefit. In law "he owns nothing, and can acquire nothing." *His right to himself is abrogated*—his limbs are another's property. If he say *my hands, my feet, my body, my mind, myself*, they are figures of speech. *To use himself for his own good is illegal*, a CRIME. *To keep what he earns is stealing*. *To take his body into his own keeping is insurrection*, and incurs outlawry. In a word, the *profit* of his master is made the END of his being, and he a *mere means* to that end, a *mere means* to an end of which he is no part—a mere instrument for the accomplishment of an object into which his interests do not enter, of which they constitute no portion.* MAN sunk to a *thing*! the intrinsic element and constituent principle of slavery; a condition in which men are sold, bartered, leased, mortgaged, bequeathed, inherited, invoiced, shipped in cargoes, stored as goods, taken on executions, and knocked off at public outcry. Their *rights* another's *conveniences*, their interests, serviceable articles or wares on sale, their happiness a household utensil or plaything, as best suits the humor of the hour—their deathless nature, conscience, social affections, sympathies, hopes, marketable commodities! We repeat it *the reduction of persons to things*; not robbing a man of privileges, but of *himself*; not loading him with burdens, but turning him into a *beast of burden*; not curtailing

* Whatever system sinks man from an END to a *means*, or in other words, whatever transforms him from an object of instrumentality into a mere instrumentality to an object, just so far makes him a *slave*. Hence West India apprenticeship retains in *one* particular the cardinal principle of slavery. The apprentice during three-fourths of his time is still forced to labor, and robbed of his earnings, just so far forth he is a *mere means*, a *slave*. True, in all other respects slavery is abolished in the British West Indies. Its bloodiest features are blotted out—but the meanest and most despicable of all—forcing the poor to work for the rich without pay three-fourths of their time, with a legal officer to flog them if they demur at the outrage, is one of the provisions of the "Emancipation Act!" For the glories of that luminary we have a thousand times thanked God, and mourned as often that it rose behind a cloud, and still shines through an eclipse.

rights, but annihilating them; not inflicting personal cruelty, but destroying *personality*; not restraining liberty, but leaving none *for* restraint; not requiring involuntary labor, but sinking the man into an *implement* of labor; not abridging his human comforts, but abrogating his *human nature*; not depriving an animal of immunities, but *despoiling a rational being of attributes*, uncreating a MAN to make room for a *thing*!

That we have truly stated the fundamental principle of American slavery is proved by the laws of slave states. Judge Stroud, in his "Sketch of the Laws relating to Slavery," says, "The cardinal principle of slavery, that the slave is not to be ranked among sentient beings but among *things*,—is an article of property, a chattel personal, obtains as undoubted law in all of these states," (the slave states.) To establish this by multiplying extracts from the laws of slaveholding states is needless. Let the following suffice. The law of South Carolina thus lays down the principle, "Slaves shall be deemed, held, taken, reputed, and adjudged in law to be *chattels personal* in the hands of their owners and possessors, and their executors, administrators, and assigns, to ALL INTENTS, CONSTRUCTIONS, AND PURPOSES WHATSOEVER." Brevard's Digest, 229. In Louisiana "a slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he *belongs*—the master may sell him—dispose of his *person, his industry, and his labor*, he can *do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire any thing*, but what must belong to his master." Civil Code of Louisiana, Art. XXXV.

This is American slavery. The sacred and infinite distinction between a person and a thing, it tramples under foot,—a distinction alike the centre and circumference of God's moral government—the crowning distinction of the universe, transcending all others as the source, the test, and the measure of their value—the rational, accountable, immortal principle, embalmed by God in everlasting remembrance, consecrated to universal homage in a baptism of glory and honor, by the gift of his Son, his Spirit, his Word, his presence, providence, and power; by his guiding wisdom, his inspiring promises, his protecting shield, upholding staff, and sheltering wing; his opening heavens, and angels ministering, and chariots of fire, and songs of

morning stars, and shoutings of the sons of God, and a great voice in the heavens proclaiming eternal sanctions, and confirming the word with signs following.

Having developed the fundamental principles of American slavery, we are prepared to inquire,

DOES THE BIBLE SANCTION SUCH A PRINCIPLE ?* To the *law* and the *testimony*. First, the moral law or the ten commandments. Just after the emancipation of the Israelites from their bondage in Egypt, as they were gathered at the foot of Sinai to receive the law, while the trumpet waxed louder, and the mountain blazed, and the people trembled and stood afar off, the ten commandments were uttered by God from the midst of clouds and thunderings. *Two* of those commandments deal death to the system of slavery. Look at the *eighth*, "*Thou shalt not steal ;*" or in other words, thou shalt not take from another what *belongs* to him. *All* that belongs to any man has either been given to him by God, or he has acquired it for himself. All his powers of body and mind are God's gift, not to his neighbors, but to *him*. That they are *his own*, and that he has a right to them, and *all* of them, is proved from the fact that God has given them to him, and to him *alone*, *all* of them—that each of them is a part of *himself*, and all of them together *constitute* himself, and *belong* to himself. *All else* that belongs to man is acquired by the *use* of these powers. The *interest* belongs to him because the *principal* does—the product is his, because the producer is. Ownership of any thing is ownership of its *use*, or rather a *right to use according to will* is *itself* ownership. The eighth commandment *presupposes and assumes the right of every man to his powers, and their product*. Slavery denies the right, and robs of both. A man's right to himself is the only right which is absolutely *original* and *intrinsic*—his right to whatever else belongs to him is merely *relative* to his right to himself, is derived from it,

* The Bible record of actions is no comment on their moral character. It vouches for them as *facts*, not as *virtues*. It records without rebuke Noah's drunkenness, Lot's incest, the lies of Jacob and his mother—not only single acts but *usages* such as polygamy and concubinage are entered on the record without censure. Is that *silent entry* God's *endorsement* ? Because the Bible in its catalogue of human actions does not stamp on every crime its name and number, and write against it, *this is a crime*—does that wash out its guilt and bleach it into a virtue ?

and held only by virtue of it. SELF-RIGHT is the *foundation right*—the *post in the middle* to which all other rights are fastened. Slaveholders the world over, when talking about their RIGHT to their slaves always assume *their own right to themselves*. What slaveholder ever undertook to prove his own right to himself? Ask him to do it, and he will say that if there is a self-evident proposition on earth, it is, that a man belongs to himself, that the right is intrinsic and absolute, and that his title to himself is the fact that he is a *human being*. The slaveholder in making out his own title to himself, makes out a title for every human being to *himself*. As the fact of being a *man* is itself the title, the whole human family have one common title-deed by which each holds himself. If *one* man's title is valid, *all* are valid. If one is good for nothing, all are worthless. A denial of the validity of the *slave's* title is equally a denial of the validity of *his own*, and yet in the very act of making him a slave, the slaveholder *asserts* the validity of his own title, and on the strength of it seizes *him* as his property who has the *same* title. Further, in making him a slave he does not merely *unhumanize one individual*, but UNIVERSAL MAN. He destroys the foundations. He annihilates *all rights*, and shows that a slaveholder is not only the enemy of the human race, but wages war against *universal being*, and makes onset upon JEHOVAH. For rights are *rights*—God's are no more, man's are no less.

The eighth commandment forbids the taking of *any*, even the least part of that which belongs to another. Slavery takes away the *whole*. Does the same Bible which forbids the taking away of *any thing* belonging to him, sanction the taking away of *every thing*? Is it such a medley of contradictory absurdities as to thunder wrath against him who robs his neighbor of a *cent*, while it bids God speed to him who robs his neighbor of *himself*? Slavery is the greatest violation of the eighth commandment possible. To take from a man his earnings, is theft. But to take the *earner*, is compound, superlative, perpetual theft; a trade, a life of robbery, that vaults through all the gradations of the climax at a leap—the dread terrific, giant, robbery that towers among other robberies, a solitary horror, monarch of the realm. The *eighth* commandment forbids the taking away, and the

tenth adds, "*Thou shalt not covet any thing that is thy neighbor's;*" thus guarding every man's right to himself and his property, by making not only the actual *taking away* a sin, but even that state of mind which would *tempt* to such an act. Who ever made human beings slaves, or held them as slaves without *coveting* them? Why do they take from them their time, their labor, their liberty, their right of self-preservation and improvement? their right to acquire property, to worship according to conscience, to search the Scriptures, to live with their families, and their right to their own bodies? Answer—they *covet* them all. Why do they *take* them if they do not *desire* them? They seize and hold them, simply because they had rather hold the fee simple proprietorship of their bodies and minds *themselves* than that the *rightful* owners should hold it. They *covet* them for purposes of gain, convenience, personal ease, lust of dominion, of sensual gratification, of pride and ostentation. They break the tenth commandment by day and by night, and pluck down upon their heads the plagues that are written in the book. *Ten* commandments constitute the brief compend of human duty. *Two* of these, as we have seen, brand slavery as sin.

The giving of the law at Sinai immediately preceded the promulgation of that body of laws and institutions, called the "Mosaic system." Over the gateway of that system, an inscription was written by the finger of God. "HE THAT STEALETH A MAN AND SELLETH HIM, OR IF HE BE FOUND IN HIS HAND, HE SHALL SURELY BE PUT TO DEATH." See Exodus xxi. 16.

When we consider the oppression of the Israelites in Egypt, and the wonders wrought for their deliverance, we shall appreciate the reason for proclaiming *such* a law at *such* a time—at the very outset of the system, when the body politic, with great solemnity, resolved itself into a theocracy and reverently waited for the will of God. They had just been emancipated. The tragedies of their house of bondage were the realities of yesterday, and rose upon their memory with paralyzing horror. They had just witnessed God's testimony against oppression in the plagues of Egypt—the burning blains on man and beast—the dust quickened into loathsome life and cleaving in myriad swarms to every living thing—the streets,

the palaces, the temples, and every house heaped up with the carcasses of things abhorred, even the kneading troughs and ovens, the secret chambers and the couches, reeking and dissolving with the putrid death—the pestilence walking in darkness at noonday, the devouring locusts and hail mingled with fire, the first-born death-struck, and the waters blood, and, last of all, that dread high hand and stretched out arm that whelmed the monarch and his hosts, and strewed their corpses on the sea. All this their eyes had looked upon,—earth's proudest city wasted and thunder-scarred, lying in desolation, and the doom of oppressors traced on her ruins in the hand writing of God, glaring in letters of fire mingled with blood—a blackened monument of wrath to the uttermost against the stealers of men.

No wonder that such a God, in a code of laws prepared for such a people at such a time, should set up on the very threshold a blazing beacon to flash terror on slaveholders and warn them off. "*He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death.*" God's cherubim and flaming sword guarding the entrance to the Mosaic system! See also Deut. xxiv. 7.*

The Hebrew word, "*Gaunab*," here rendered *stealeth*, means the taking from another what *belongs* to him, whether it be by violence or fraud; the same word is used in the eighth commandment and all the catechisms extant, both protestant and Catholic include *robbery* under the prohibitions of the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal."

The crime specified in the passage is that of *depriving SOMEBODY of the ownership of a man*. Who is this *somebody*? Is it a master? and is the crime that of depriving a *master* of his *servant*? Then it would have been "he that *stealeth*" a *servant*, not "he that *stealeth* a *man*," for if the crime had been that of taking an individual from *another*, then the *term* used would have been *expressive of that relation*, and *most especially* if it was the taking of an individual from another who was his *proprietor*!

* Jarchi, the most eminent of the Jewish Commentators, (if we except perhaps the Egyptian Maimonides,) who wrote seven hundred years ago, in his comment on this stealing and making merchandise of men, gives the meaning thus:—"Using a man against his will, as a servant lawfully purchased; yea, though he should use his services ever so little, only to the value of a farthing, or use but his arm to lean on to support him, *if he be forced so to act as a servant*, the person compelling him but once to do so shall die as a thief, whether he has sold him or not."

The crime is stated in a three-fold form, *man stealing*, *selling*, and *holding*. All are put on a level, and one penalty launched at the whole—DEATH. But who is this *somebody* that is deprived of the ownership of a man? It is the *man himself*, robbed of the ownership of his own person. Joseph said to the butler and baker of Pharaoh, "Indeed I was *stolen* away out of the land of the Hebrews." Gen. xl. 15. How *stolen*? His brethren took him and disposed of him as an *article of merchandise*. Well might he say, "Indeed I was *stolen*." Contrast this penalty for *man-stealing* with that for *property-stealing*, which is laid down at length in the beginning of the next chapter, Exod. xxii. If a man stole an *ox* and killed or sold it, he was to restore five oxen; if he had neither sold nor killed it, the penalty was two oxen. The selling or the killing being virtually a deliberate repetition of the crime, the penalty was more than doubled.

But in the case of stealing a *man* the whole power of punishment was expended upon the *first* act; however often repeated, or however aggravated the crime, human penalty could do no more. The fact that the penalty for *man-stealing* was death, and the penalty for *property-stealing*, whatever the kind, or however great the amount, was the mere *restoration of double*, shows that the two cases were adjudicated on totally different principles. The man stolen might be past labor, and consequently his support a *burden*, yet death was the penalty, though not a cent's worth of *property value* was taken. The penalty for stealing *property* was a mere *property-penalty*. The payment of *double* wiped out the score however large the amount stolen. Though it might have a greater *money* value than a *thousand* men, *death* was never the penalty, nor maiming, nor branding, nor even *stripes*. When all kinds of animals, or when money, furniture, goods, articles of clothing, or food were stolen, the unvarying penalty was double of *the same kind*. Why was not the rule uniform? When a *man* was stolen why not require the thief to restore *double of the same kind*—*two men*, or if he had sold him, *five men*? Is it answered that the man-thief might not *have* them? So the *ox*-thief might not have two *oxen*, or if he had killed it, *five*. But if God permitted men to hold *men* as property equally with *oxen*, the *man*-thief could

get *men* with whom to pay the penalty, as well as the *ox-thief, oxen*.

Further, the whole of the legal penalty when *property* was stolen, was a pecuniary remuneration to the person injured. But when a *man* was stolen no property compensation was offered, either to the individual; or to the community. To tender *money* as an equivalent, would have been to repeat the outrage with the intolerable aggravations of supreme insult and impiety. Compute the value of a *MAN* in *money*! Throw earth's dust into the scale against immortality! The law recoiled from such mockery of man and blasphemy of God. To have permitted the man-thief to expiate his crime by restoring double of the *same kind*, would have been making the repetition of crime its atonement, and exalting into a virtue the accursed thing against which the penalty was levelled. But the infliction of death for *man-stealing* exacted from the guilty wretch the utmost possibility of reparation.

If wrung from him, as he gave up the ghost, a testimony in blood, and death-groans, to the infinite dignity and worth of man,—a proclamation to the universe voiced in mortal agony, that *MAN* IS INVIOABLE,—a confession shrieked in phrenzy at the grave's mouth—"I die accursed, and God is just."

If God permitted man to hold *man* as property, why did he punish for stealing *that* kind of property infinitely more than for stealing any *other* kind of property? Why did he punish with *death* for stealing a very little, perhaps not a sixpence worth, of *that* sort of property, and make a mere *fine* the penalty for stealing a thousand times as much, of any other sort of property—especially since according to the objection, God did by his own act annihilate the difference between man and all kinds of property, by putting him *on a level with them*.

The atrociousness of a crime depends greatly upon the nature, character, relations, and condition of the victim. To steal is a crime, whoever the thief, or whatever the plunder. To steal bread from a *full* man, is theft; to steal it from a *starving* man, is both theft and murder. If I steal my neighbor's *property*, the crime consists not in altering the intrinsic *nature* of the article, but in *shifting its external relation* from *him* to *me*. But when I take my neigh-

bor *himself*, and first make him *property*, and then *my* property, the latter act, which was the sole crime in the former case, dwindles to a mere appendage. The sin in stealing a man does not consist in transferring, from its owner to another, that which is *already property*, but in turning *personality* into *property*. True, that which constitutes him, *man*, is, in its nature, unalterable by man. The *attributes* of man still remain, but the rights and immunities which grow out of them are *annihilated*. It is the great law of reason to regard things and beings as they are; and the sum of religion, to feel and act toward them according to their nature and value. Knowingly to treat them otherwise, is *sin*; and the heinousness of the sin, is to be measured by the degree of violence done to their nature, relations, and value. When things are sundered, which God has indissolubly joined, or confounded in one, which he has separated by infinite extremes, when sacred and eternal distinctions, which he has garnished with glory, are set at naught, and trampled on, then, if ever, *sin* reddens in its "scarlet dye." The sin specified in the passage, is that of doing violence to the *nature* of a *man*—impiously deriding his *intrinsic value* and relations as a rational being, and blotting out the distinction stamped upon him by his Maker. In the verse immediately preceding, and in that which follows, the *same principle* is laid down. In the fifteenth verse, "*He that smiteth his father or his mother, shall surely be put to death.*" In the seventeenth, the penalty of death is denounced for the *cursing* of a parent. If a Jew gave his neighbor a stroke, the law merely struck him in return. But if that same blow had been given to a *parent*, the law struck the smiter *dead*. Why this vast disparity in the punishment of the same act inflicted on different persons? Answer—God guards the parental relation with peculiar care. It is the *centre* of human relations. The violation of that is the violation of *all*. The fact that an individual could trample on *that*, showed that *no* relation had any sacredness in his eyes—that he was unfit to move about among human relations who had violated one so sacred and tender. Therefore, the Mosaic law raised on high his bleeding corpse, and brandished the ghastly terror around the parental relation to guard its sacred precincts from impious inroads.

But why the difference in the penalty since the *act* was the same? The sin committed had divers aggravations.

1. The relation violated was so obvious—the distinction between parents and others so manifest, dictated by natural affection—a law of the constitution.

2. The act was violence to nature—a suicide on constitutional susceptibilities.

3. The parental relation then, as now, was the centre of the social system, and required powerful safe-guards. God gave his testimony to this in the moral law, "Honor thy father and thy mother," stands at the head of those commands which prescribe the duties of man to man; and, throughout the Bible, the parental relation is God's favorite illustration, by which to show forth his own relations to the whole family of man, and his tender regard for all who in the spirit of adoption, say, "Our Father." In this case death was inflicted not at all for the act of *smiting*, nor for smiting a *man*, but a *parent*. The penalty for violating a vital and sacred relation—for disregarding a *distinction* cherished by God, as the apple of his eye, and around which, both in the moral and the ceremonial law, He threw up a bulwark of defence. In the next verse, "He that stealeth a man," &c., the SAME PRINCIPLE is wrought out in still stronger relief. The crime here punished with death is not the mere act of taking property from its owner, but it is a crime of another sort. The disregarding of *fundamental relations*, doing violence to an *immortal nature*, making war on a *sacred distinction* of priceless worth, and infinitely dear to the heart of God. That distinction which is spurned, and cast headlong by the principle and system of American slavery which makes MEN "*chattels*."

The incessant pains-taking throughout the Old Testament in the entire separation of human beings from brutes and things, shows God's regard for the sacredness of his own distinction.

"In the beginning" the Lord uttered it in heaven, and proclaimed it to the universe as it rose into being. He arrayed creation at the instant of its birth, to do it reverent homage. He bade it pause in adoration, while He ushered forth its crowning work. Why that dread pause, and that creating arm held back in mid career, and that high conference in the godhead, "*Let us make man in OUR IMAGE*

after OUR LIKENESS, AND LET HIM HAVE DOMINION over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth."

Then while every living thing, with land, and sea, and firmament, and marshalled worlds, waited to catch and swell the shout of morning stars ; THEN "GOD CREATED MAN IN HIS OWN IMAGE. IN THE IMAGE OF GOD CREATED HE HIM." This solves the problem, IN THE IMAGE OF GOD CREATED HE HIM. Well might the sons of God cry all together, "Amen, alleluia"—"*Thou art worthy, oh ! Lord, to receive blessing and honor*"—"For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands—thou hast put all things under his feet. Oh ! Lord, our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth," Psalms viii. 5, 6, 9. The frequent and solemn repetition of this distinction by God proclaims his infinite regard. The 26th, 27th, and 28th verses of the 1st chapter of Genesis are little else than the repetition of it in various forms. In the 5th chapter, 1st verse, we find it again—"In the day that God created man; IN THE LIKENESS OF GOD MADE HE MAN." In the 9th chapter, 6th verse, we find it again. After giving unrestrained license to shed the blood of "every moving thing that liveth," it is added, "*Whoso sheddeth man's blood by man shall his blood be shed—for* IN THE IMAGE OF GOD MADE HE MAN." As though he had said, "All these other living creatures are your property, designed for your use—they have the likeness of earth, they perish with the using, and their spirits go downward, but this other living being, MAN, has *my own likeness*. IN THE IMAGE OF GOD made I man ; an intelligent, moral, immortal agent, invited to all that I can give and he can be." So in Leviticus xxiv. 17, 18, "*He that killeth any MAN shall surely be put to death ; and he that killeth a beast shall make it good beast, for beast, and he that killeth a MAN shall be put to death.*" So in the passage quoted incidentally above, Psalms viii. 5. 6. What an enumeration of particulars, each separating by an infinite extreme, MEN from brutes and things !

1. *Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels.*" Slavery drags him down among brutes.

2. "*And hast crowned him with glory and honor.*" Slavery tears off his crown and bows him under a yoke.

3. "*Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands.*" Slavery wrenches away his sceptre and crushes him down *among* those works, yea, *beneath* them.

4. "*Thou hast put all things under his feet.*" Slavery puts HIM *under the feet of an owner*, along with beasts and creeping things; makes him a "chattel personal" in his hands "to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever" until death. Who, but an impious scorner of God, his works, his word, HIS IMAGE, dare thus strive with his Maker, and mutilate his "likeness," and blaspheme the Holy One, who saith to those that grind his poor, "*Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these ye did it unto me.*"

But time would fail us to detail the instances in which this distinction is set on high in the Bible, and invested with all the attributes of inviolable sacredness. "*He that runneth may read, and whoso readeth let him understand.*"

In further prosecuting this inquiry the Patriarchal and Mosaic systems will be considered in conjunction, as each reflects light upon the other, and as many of the most important regulations of the latter are mere embodyings in legal form of Divine institutions previously existing. As a *system*, however, the latter alone is of Divine authority. Whatever were the usages of the *patriarchs* God has not made them our exemplars.*

Before entering upon an analysis of the general condition of servants under these two states of society, it is important to settle the import of certain terms used in describing the mode of procuring them.

IMPORT OF THE WORD "BUY" AND THE PHRASE "BOUGHT WITH MONEY."

From the direction to the Israelites to "buy" their servants, and from the phrase "bought with money," applied

* Those who "lay the flattering unction to their souls," that the patriarchs held slaves, and sit with such delight under their shadow, hymning the praises of "those good old patriarchs and slaveholders," might at small cost greatly augment their numbers. A single stanza celebrating patriarchal *concubinage* winding off with a chorus in honor of patriarchal *drunkenness*, would be a trumpet-call summoning from bush and brake, high way and hedge and sheltering fence, a brotherhood of kindred affinities, each claiming Abraham or Noah as his patron saint, and shouting, "My name is legion," thus swelling to myriads the choir, and to thunders the song of grateful praise.

to Abraham's servants, it is argued that such persons were bought and held as articles of *property*. The sole ground for this belief is the *terms themselves*, "buy" and "bought with money," and such an import to these terms when applied to servants under the Patriarchal and Mosaic systems, is assumed, not only in the absence of all proof, but in the face of evidence to the contrary. How much time and toil might be saved, if in discussion the thing to be proved was always *assumed*. To begin by *begging* a question in debate would be great economy of midnight oil, and a forestaller of premature wrinkles, and grey hairs by the multitude. Instead of protracted investigation into Scripture usage, and painful collation of passages, and cautious tracing of minute relations, to find out the meaning of Scripture terms, let every man boldly resolve to interpret the language of the oldest book in the world by the usages of his own time and place, and the work is done. And then what a march of mind! Instead of *one* revelation they would be multiplied as the drops of the morning! And every man of every tribe, and tongue, might be admitted to orders as an inspired interpreter, possessing an infallible clue to the mind of the Spirit on every abstruse point, if he only understands the dialect of his own neighborhood. We repeat it, the only ground of the conviction that these terms are to be interpreted to mean, when applied to servants in the Bible, the same that they mean when applied to our *slaves*, is the *terms themselves*.

What a Babel-jargon would be made of the Bible if it were taken for granted that the sense in which words are now used is the *inspired* sense.

David says, "I prevented the dawning of the morning and cried." What a miracle-worker! He stopped the earth in its revolution! Rather too fast. Two hundred years ago *prevent* was used in the strict Latin sense, to *come before* or *anticipate*. It is always used in this sense in the Old and New Testaments. David's expression translated into the English of the nineteenth century would be, "Before the dawning of the morning I cried," or I began to cry before day-break. "So my prayer shall *prevent* thee." "Let us *prevent* his face with thanksgiving." "Mine eyes *prevent* the night watches." "We shall not *prevent* them that are asleep," &c. In almost every chap-

ter of the Bible words are used in a sense now nearly or quite obsolete. A few examples follow. "Oftentimes I purposed to come to you, but was *let* (hindered) hitherto." "And the four *beasts* (living ones) fell down and worshipped God,"—"Whosoever shall *offend* (cause to sin) one of these little ones,"—"Go out into the high ways and *compel* (urge) them to come in,"—"Only let your *conversation* (habitual conduct or course of life) be as becometh the Gospel,"—"They that seek me *early* (earnestly) shall find me,"—"Give me *by-and-by* (now) in a charger the head of John the Baptist,"—"So when tribulation or persecution ariseth *by-and-by* (immediately) they are offended. Nothing is more mutable than language. Words, like bodies, are continually throwing off particles and absorbing others. So long as they are the representatives of things and relations, elected by the whims of universal suffrage, their meaning will be a perfect volatile, and to cork it up for the next century is an employment sufficiently silly (to speak within bounds) for a Biblical professor or a modern Bible dictionary maker. There never surely was a shallower conceit than that of making the *present* sense of a word, its sense centuries ago, by quoting its meaning now to *prove* that it meant so then. Pity that hyper-fashionable mantuamakers and milliners were not a little quicker at taking hints from some of our Doctors of Divinity. How easily they could save their pious customers all qualms of conscience about the weekly shiftings of fashion by demonstrating that the last importation of Parisian indecency that is just now flaunting here in coaches and on promenade was the identical style of dress in which the pious Sarah kneaded cakes for the angels, and the modest Rebecca drew water for the camels of Abraham's servant. The proof is unquestionable, since such fashions are *now* rife in Chestnut-street and Broadway they *must* have been in Canaan and Padanaram four thousand years ago!

II. 1. The inference that the word *buy*, used to describe the procuring of servants means procuring them as *chattels* or *property* seems based upon this fallacy,—that whatever *costs* money is money, that whatever or whoever you pay money *for* is an article of property, and the fact of your paying for it *proves* that it is property. The children of Israel were required to *purchase* their first-born out

from under the obligations of the priesthood, Númb. xviii. 15, 16; Exod. xxxiv. 20. It was called *buying* their first-born. This custom is kept up to this day among the Jews, and the word *buy* is still used to describe the transaction. Does this prove that their first-born were, or are held as property? They were *bought* as really as were servants. So the Israelites were required to *pay money* for their own souls. This is called sometimes a ransom, sometimes an atonement. Were their *souls* therefore marketable commodities?

2. Bible saints bought their wives. Boaz bought his wife Ruth. "So Ruth the Moabitess, the wife of Mahlon, have I *purchased* to be my wife." Ruth iv. 10. The Prophet Hosea bought his wife. "So I *bought* her to me for fifteen pieces of silver, and for an homer of barley, and an half homer of barley."—Hosea iii. 2. Jacob bought his wives Rachel and Leah, and not having money, paid for them in labor—seven years a piece.—Gen. xxix. 15–29. Moses probably obtained his wife in the same way, and paid for her by his labor as the servant of her father.—Exod. ii. 21. Shechem the son of Hamor, when negotiating with Jacob and his sons for Dinah to be his wife, says, "What ye shall say unto me I will give. Ask me never so much dowry and gift and I will give according as ye shall say unto me." Gen. xxxiv. 11, 12. David purchased Michal, Saul's daughter, and Othniel, Achsah, the daughter of Caleb, by performing perilous services for the benefit of their fathers-in-law.—1 Sam. xviii. 25–27, and Judges i. 12, 13. That the purchase of wives, either by a payment in money or an equivalent in service, was the general practice under the Mosaic system is plain from various passages, such as Exod. xxii. 17, and 1 Sam. xviii. 25. Among the Jews of the present day this ancient usage exists, though it is now a mere form, there being no *real* purchase. Yet among their marriage ceremonies, is one called "marrying by the penny." The coincidences not only in the methods of procuring wives and servants, and in the terms employed in describing the transactions, but in the prices paid for each, are worthy of notice. The highest price of wives (virgins) and servants was the same. Compare Deut. xxii. 28, 29, and Exod. xxii. 17, with Lev. xxvii. 2–8.

The *medium* price of wives and servants was the same. Compare Hosea iii. 2, with Exod. xxi. 2. Hosea appears to have paid one half in money and the other in grain. Further, the Israelitish female bought-servants were *wives*, their husbands and their masters being the same persons. Exod xxi. 8, and Judges xix. 3. 27. If *buying* servants among the Jews shows that they were property, and if the fact of their being bought is proof sufficient, then their buying *wives* shows that *they* were property, and the fact that *they* were bought is proof sufficient. The words in the original which are used to describe the one, describe the other. Why not contend that the wives of the ancient fathers of the faithful and of the men after God's own heart, were their chattels and used as ready change at a pinch. And thence deduce the rights of modern husbands. How far gone is the Church from primitive purity! How slow to emulate the illustrious examples of patriarchs and prophets! When will pious husbands, by living up fully to their Bible privileges, become partakers with Old Testament worthies in the true glories of a husband's immunities! It demands a doubt whether professors of religion now are not *bound* to buy and hold their wives as property. Refusing so to do, is questioning the morality of those "good old" wife-trading "patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," with the prophets, and a host of whom the world was not worthy. Besides, let Christian husbands *cash* their wives, and what might not be accomplished with the proceeds? When the world is to be converted through Bibles, tracts, and missionaries, when all the religious anniversaries are just at hand, and money three per cent a month in Wall-street!

The use of the word buy, to describe the procuring of wives is not peculiar to the Hebrew. In the Syriac language the common expression for "the married," or "the espoused" is "the bought." Even so late as the 16th century the common record of *marriages* in the old German Chronicles was "A. BOUGHT B."

3. That the Hebrew word translated *buy* takes its modification from the nature of the subject to which it is applied is manifest. Eve says, "I have *gotten* (bought) a man of the Lord." She named him Cain that is *bought*. "He that

heareth reproof, getteth (buyeth,) understanding.—Prov. xv. 32.—So in Isa. xi. 11. "The Lord shall set his hand again to recover (to *buy*,) the remnant of his people."—So Ps. lxxviii. 54. He brought them to this mountain which his right hand had *purchased*, i. e. gotten.—Jer. xiii. 4. "Take the girdle that thou hast got" (bought) Neh. v. 8. "We of our ability have *redeemed* (bought) our brethren that were sold to the heathen." Here "*bought*" instead of proving that the person was bought into the condition of a slave, proves him *free*.—Prov. viii. 22. "The Lord possessed (bought) me (Christ) in the beginning of his way before his works of old." Prov. xv. 32. "He that heareth reproof *getteth* (buyeth) understanding."—Ps. xix. 8. "He that *getteth* (buyeth) wisdom loveth his own soul."—Prov. xvi. 16. "How much better is it to *get* (buy) wisdom than gold?"—Ezk. viii. 3. Where was the seat of the image of jealousy which *provoketh* (buyeth) to jealousy. It may be remarked that to *buy*, is a *secondary* meaning of the Hebrew word *Kaunan*.

4. Even at this day the word *buy* is used in common parlance to describe the transaction of procuring servants, where the system of slavery is abolished. In the British West Indies, where the slaves have become apprentices, whether their services are procured for the whole or only a part of the remaining term they are "*bought*." This is now the current word in West India Newspapers. So a few years since in New-York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and even now in New Jersey servants are "*bought*" as really as in Virginia. And the different senses in which the same word is used in the two states, puts no man in a quandary, whose common sense amounts to a modicum.

So under the system of legal *indenture* in Illinois, servants now are "*bought*." That is the word and the only word used to describe the mode of procuring their service.* A short time since hundreds of foreigners coming to this country were "*bought*" annually. By voluntary contract they came under obligation to work for their purchasers a given time to pay for their passage. This class of persons called "*redemptioners*" consisted at one time of many

* The following statute is now in force in the State of Illinois. "No negro, mulatto, or Indian shall at any time *purchase* any servant other than of their own complexion, and if any of the persons aforesaid shall presume to *purchase* a white servant, such servant shall immediately become free and shall be so held, deemed and taken."

thousands. Hundreds are every year *bought out* of slavery by themselves or others, and remove into free states. Under the same roof with the writer is a "servant bought with money." A few weeks since she was a slave. As soon as "bought" she was a slave no longer. All the classes of persons enumerated above were "bought servants" but not a *slave* among them. Alas for our leading politicians if "buying" men makes them "chattels." How long is it since all the Whig papers told us that Benton, Rives, Buchanan and Wright were "bought" by the administration with the surplus revenue; and those of the other party, that Clay, Calhoun, Webster, and Poindexter, were "bought" by the Bank. Quite a speculation!

The histories of the Revolution tell us that Benedict Arnold was "bought" by British gold. Did that make him an article of property? When a northern clergyman marries a rich southern widow, they have a current phrase in country gossip that hits off the indecency graphically "The cotton bags *bought* him."

When Horace Walpole said "every man has his price and whoever will pay it, can *buy* him," and when John Randolph said, while the Missouri question was pending in Congress, the "whole northern delegation is in the market, give me money enough and I can *buy* them," they both meant *just what they said*. When the temperance publications tell us that candidates for office "*buy*" men with whiskey, and the oracles of street tattle, that the court, district attorney, and jury in a late celebrated trial, were "*bought*" we are at no loss as to the meaning, have no floating visions of "chattels personal" man-auctions, or coffles.

The transaction between Joseph and the Egyptians gives a clue to the meaning attached to "Buy" and "Bought with money."—See Genesis xlvii. 18—26. The Egyptians came to Joseph with the formal proposition to become servants, and that he should *buy* them. When the bargain was closed, Joseph said to them, "Behold I have *bought you* this day," and yet, from the whole transaction, it is plain that neither of the parties dreamed that the persons *bought* were in any sense articles of property; but merely that they became thereby obligated to labor on certain conditions for the government, as a *compensation* for the entire support of themselves and families during the famine. And

that the idea attached to "buy us," and "behold I have bought you," was merely that of the procuring of services voluntarily offered, and secured by formal contract, as a return *for value received*; and not at all that the *persons* were thereby dispossessed of their personal ownership, and became articles of property. And this buying of services, or rather a *fifth* part of them, (as they were to give one fifth part of their crops to Pharaoh,) is called in Scripture usage, *buying the men*. This case deserves special notice, as it is the only one in the Bible where the whole transaction of buying servants is given in detail—the views of both parties, the preliminaries, the process, the mutual acquiescence, and the permanent relation which was the result. In all other instances, where the buying of servants is spoken of, the mere fact is stated without entering into particulars. In this case, the whole process is laid open.

1. The persons "bought," sold themselves, and wholly of their own accord.

2. Obtaining the services of persons, or even a portion of them, permanently is called "buying" those persons. The objector takes it for granted at the outset, that the bought servants were purchased of *third* persons; and thence infers that they were articles of property. Now this bold assumption is utterly unsupported by the Bible. There is not a single instance recorded of a servant being sold by any one but himself; not a case either under the patriarchal, or the Mosaic systems, in which a master sold his servant. That the servants who were "bought" *sold* themselves, is a fair inference from a variety of passages of Scripture beside the case of Joseph and the Egyptians.

In Leviticus xxv. 47, the case of the Israelite, who became the servant of the stranger, the words are, "If he **SELL HIMSELF** unto the stranger." Is it not a little remarkable that the *same word*, and the *same form* of the word, which, in the 47th verse, is rendered *sell himself*, is in the 39th verse of the same chapter rendered *be sold*; so much for the influence of pro-slavery associations. In Deuteronomy xxviii. 68, the same word is rendered "be sold." Here it is the hithpael conjugation, which is reflexive in its force, and, like the middle voice in Greek, represents what an individual does for himself, or in his own concerns; and should manifestly have been rendered, ye shall *offer yourselves* for sale.

The following passages furnish a clue to Scripture usage on this point. 1 Kings xxi. 20, 25.—“Thou hast *sold thyself* to work evil.” “There was none like to Ahab that *sold himself* to work wickedness.”—2 Kings xvii. 17. They used divination and enchantments and *sold themselves* to do evil.”—Isaiah l. 1. “For your iniquities have ye *sold yourselves*. Isaiah lii. 3, “Ye have *sold yourselves* FOR NOUGHT, and ye shall be redeemed without money.”—See also, Jeremiah xxxiv. 14—Romans vii. 14, and vi. 16—John viii. 34. Again, we infer that they were not *bought of third persons*, because no mention is ever made of it. The purchase of wives is spoken of not many times in the Bible, and yet in a considerable majority of cases it is expressly stated that they were bought of *third persons*. Is it not a fair inference, if servants were bought of third persons, that there would *sometimes* have been such an intimation.

Our second subject of inquiry is,

THE LEADING DESIGN OF THE MOSAIC LAWS RELATING
TO MASTERS AND SERVANTS, WITH AN ENUMERATION OF
THE RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES SECURED TO SERVANTS.

The general object of those statutes, which prescribed the relations of master and servant, was the good of both parties—but more especially the good of the *servants*. While the interests of the master were carefully guarded from injury, those of the servants were sedulously *promoted*.

These laws were a merciful provision for the poorer classes, both of the Israelites and strangers.

Not imposing burdens grievous to be borne, but designed as a relief from afflictive burdens—a grant of *privileges*—a bestowment of *favours*. In proof of this, we state.

1. *The fact that no servant from the strangers, could remain a servant in the family of an Israelite, without becoming a proselyte.* Compliance with this condition was the *price of the privilege*.—Genesis xvii. 9—14, 23, 27.

2. *Excommunication from the family was a PUNISHMENT.*—Genesis xxi. 14—Luke xvi. 2—4.

3. *The fact that every Hebrew servant could COMPEL his master to keep him in his family after the original six-years contract had expired,* shows that the system was

framed to advance the interests and gratify the wishes of the servant, *quite as much* as those of the master. If the servant *demand*ed it, the law *obliged* the master to retain him in his household, however little occasion he might have for his services, or great his dislike to the individual. Deuteronomy xv. 12—17, and Exodus xxi. 2—6.

4. *The rights and privileges guaranteed by law to all servants.*

(1.) *They were admitted into covenant with God.*—Deuteronomy xxix. 10—13.

(2.) *They were invited guests at the feast of the Passover, and all the national, as well as the family festivals of the household in which they resided.*—Exodus xii. 43—44; Deuteronomy xii. 12, 18, and xvi. 10—16.

(3.) *They were stately instructed in morality and religion.*—Deuteronomy xxxi. 10—13; Joshua viii. 33—35; 2 Chronicles xvii. 8—9.

(4.) *They were released from their regular labor for an amount of time nearly equal to ONE HALF OF THE WHOLE.* During this time the law secured to them not only an exemption from labor, but the entire support of themselves and their families; and the same public and family instruction that was provided for the other members of the Hebrew community.

(a.) The Law secured to them the *whole of every seventh year*,—Lev. xxv. 3—6; thus giving to those servants that remained such during the entire period between the jubilees, *eight whole years* (including the Jubilee year) of unbroken rest.

(b.) *Every seventh day.* This in forty-two years, (the eight being subtracted from the fifty) would amount to just *six years*.

(c.) *The three great annual festivals.* The *Passover* which commenced on the 15th of the 1st month, and lasted seven days, Deut. xvi. 3, 8. The *Pentecost*, or feast of Weeks, which began on the sixth day of the third month, and lasted seven days,—Lev. xvi. 10, 11. And the feast of *Tabernacles*, the celebration of which commenced on the 15th of the seventh month, and lasted eight days,—Deut. xvi. 13, 15.—Lev. xxiii. 34—39. As they were required to meet in one place from all parts of the land, much time would be consumed on their journey by the slow movement of their

cumbered caravans, and after their arrival at the place of sacrifice, a day or two at least, would be requisite for divers preparations; before entering on the celebration of the festival, besides some time at the close of it, in necessary preparations for their return. If we assign three weeks to each festival—including the time spent on the journey going and returning, and the necessary delays before and after the celebration, together with the *festival week*; it will be a meagre allowance of time for the absence of the bulk of the people from their homes and regular labor. As the festivals occurred three times in the year, the main body of the servants would be released from their stated employments at least *nine weeks annually*, in attendance upon these tri-yearly celebrations, which would amount in 42 years subtracting the sabbaths, to six years and 84 days.

(e.) *The new moons.* The Jewish year had twelve, Josephus tells us that the Jews always kept *two* days for the new moon. See Calmet on the Jewish Calender, and Horne's Introduction, also 1 Sam. xx. 18, 19, 27. This would amount in 42 years, to two years 280 days, after the necessary subtractions.

(f.) *The feast of trumpets.*—On the first day of the seventh month, and of the civil year.—Lev. xxiii. 24, 25.

(g.) *The day of atonement.* On the tenth of the seventh month.—Lev. xxiii. 27—32.

These two last feasts would both consume not less than 65 days of time not otherwise reckoned.

Thus it appears that those persons who continued servants during the whole period between the jubilees, were by law released from their labour, TWENTY-THREE YEARS AND SIXTY-FOUR DAYS, OUT OF FIFTY YEARS, and those who remained a less time in the same proportion. It will be perceived that in the calculation besides making a generous donation of all the *fractions* to the pro-slavery advocates, we have left entirely out of the account, those numerous *local* festivals to which frequent allusion is made, as in Judges xxi. 19. 1 Sam. 9th Chapter. And the various *family* festivals, such as at the weaning of children; at marriages; at sheep shearings; at the making of covenants, &c. to which reference is often made, as in 1st Sam. xx. 28, 29. Neither have we included those memorable festivals instituted at a later period of the Jewish history. The feast of Purim, Esther, ix. 28, 29.

And the feast of the Dedication, which lasted eight days. John x. 22. 1 Mac. iv. 59.

Finally, the Mosaic system secured to all servants, an amount of time, which if distributed would on an average be nearly ONE HALF OF THE DAYS IN EACH YEAR, for the purposes of rest, and mental and moral improvement. Meanwhile they and their families were supported and furnished with opportunities of instruction. If this amount of time were distributed over *every day*, the case would stand thus: the servants would have *to themselves* all but a *fraction* of ONE HALF OF THE DAY, and would labor for their masters the remaining fraction and the other half of the day.

THIS REGULATION, BE IT REMEMBERED, IS ONE OF THE MOST PROMINENT FEATURES OF THAT MOSAIC SYSTEM TO WHICH WE ARE TRIUMPHANTLY POINTED AS THE GREAT PROTOTYPE OF AMERICAN SLAVERY.'

5. *The servant was protected by law equally with the other members of the community*: His life, person, property, reputation, conscience, and all his natural rights were in the eyes of the law as sacred, as those of his master.

Proof—"Hear the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously between every man and his neighbour and THE STRANGER THAT IS WITH HIM." "Ye shall not RESPECT PERSONS in judgment, but ye shall hear the SMALL as well as the great." Deut. i. 16, 17. Also in Lev. xxiv. 22. "Ye shall have one manner of law as well for the stranger, as for one of your own country for I am the Lord your God. So Numbers xv. 29. "Ye shall have ONE LAW for him that sinneth through ignorance, both for him that is born among the children of Israel, and for the *stranger* that sojourneth among them. Deut. xxvii. 19. Cursed be he that PERVERTETH THE JUDGMENT OF THE STRANGER, the fatherless and the widow.

6. *The Mosaic system enjoined upon the Israelites the greatest affection and kindness toward their servants, foreign as well as Jewish.*

Lev. xix. 34. *The stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself.* Also Deut. x. 17, 19. *For the Lord your God is God of gods, and Lord of lords, a great God, a mighty and a terrible which REGARDETH NOT PERSONS nor taketh reward, He doth execute the judgment*

of the fatherless and widow, and LOVETH THE STRANGER, in giving him food and raiment LOVE YE THEREFORE THE STRANGER,—So Exodus xxii. 21. *Thou shalt neither vex a stranger nor oppress him.*" Exodus xxiii. 9. "Thou shalt not oppress a stranger for ye know the heart of a stranger." Lev. xxv. 35, 36. "If thy brother be waxen poor thou shalt relieve him, yea, though he be a STRANGER or a sojourner, that he may *live with thee*, take thou no usury of him or increase, but *fear thy God.*" (What an absurdity to suppose that *this same stranger* could be taken by one that *feared his God*, and held as a *slave* forced to labor, and robbed of time, earnings, and all his rights.)

7. *Servants were placed upon a level with their masters in all civil and religious rights.* Without quoting passages at length the reader is referred to the following in proof. Numb. xv. 15, 16, 29. Numb. ix. 14. Deut. i. 16, 17. Lev. xxiv. 22.

We now proceed to the third subject of inquiry.

WERE THE SERVANTS IN A VOLUNTARY CONDITION?
DID THEY BECOME, AND CONTINUE SUCH OF THEIR OWN
ACCORD, OR WERE THEY MADE SERVANTS AGAINST
THEIR WILLS?

We argue that it was a *voluntary* condition.

1. Because to become a servant in the family of an Israelite, was to abjure idolatry, to enter into covenant with God* to be circumcised in token of it, to be bound to the

* Maimonides who wrote in Egypt about seven hundred years ago, a cotemporary with Jarchi, and who stands with him at the head of Jewish commentators gives the following testimony on this point.

"Whether a servant be born in the power of an Israelite, or whether he be purchased from the heathen, the master is to bring them both into the covenant.

"But he that is in the *house* is entered on the eighth day, and he that is bought with money, on the day on which the master receives him, unless the slave be *unwilling*.

"For if the master receive a grown 'slave and he be *unwilling*, his master is to bear with him, to seek to win him over by instruction, and by love, and kindness for one year. After which, should he *refuse* so long, it is forbidden to keep him, longer than a year.

"And the master must send him back to the strangers from whence he came. For the God of Jacob will not accept any other than the worship of a *willing* heart."—Maimon. Hilcoth, Miloth, Chap. 1st, Sec. 8th.

The ancient Jewish Doctors agree in the testimony, that the servant from the strangers who at the close of his probationary year, still refused to adopt the religion of the Mosaic system, and was on that account cut off from the family, and sent back to his own people, received a *full compensation* for his services, besides the payment of his expenses. But that *postponement* of the circumcision of the

observance of the Sabbath, of the Passover, the Pentecost, and the feast of Tabernacles, and to consent to instruction in all the particulars of the moral and ceremonial law.

Were the servants *pushed* through all these processes by *main strength*? Was the renunciation of idolatry compulsory? Were they *dragged* into covenant with God? Were they seized and circumcised by *force*? Were they *compelled* mechanically to chew and swallow the flesh of the Paschal lamb, while they abhorred the institution, despised its ceremonies, scorned and spurned the law which enjoined it, detested its author and its executors, and instead of rejoicing in the deliverance which it commemorated, bewailed it as a calamity, and cursed the day of its consummation?

Were they *driven* from all parts of the land three times in the year up to the annual festivals? Were they to be drugged with instruction which they nauseated? Were they goaded through a round of ceremonies which they looked upon as senseless and disgusting mummeries; and drilled to perfection in a creed, to them a bill of abominations?

We repeat it to become a *servant*, was to become a *proselyte*. And how did God authorize his people to make proselytes? At the point of the javelin? By the terror of pains and penalties? By converting men into *merchandise*? Were *proselyte* and *chattel* synonymes, in the Divine vocabulary? Must a man have been made into a *thing* before he could be taken into covenant with God? Was reduction to a *commodity*, the stipulated condition of adoption, and a passport to the communion of the saints?

2. We argue the voluntariness of servants from Deut. xxiii. 15, 16, "*Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee. He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose, in one of thy gates where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him.*"

If a servant ran away from his master, he was not

foreign servant for a year, (or even at all after he had entered the family of an Israelite) of which the Mishnic doctors speak—seems to have been a *mere usage*. We find nothing of it in the regulations of the Mosaic system. Circumcision was manifestly a rite strictly *initiatory*. Whether it was a rite merely *national* or *spiritual*, or both comes not within the scope of this inquiry. Nor does it at all affect the argument.

compelled to show cause, or assign reasons. The public had no power to appoint committees to investigate the case, send for persons and papers, or listen to the master's story. As though God had said, 'The *fact of escape* settles the question, and is your sole ground of action in the premises. His FLEEING from that condition shows his own *choice*—his conviction that his interests were not promoted in it, and you are to regard it as his public proclamation that he was *oppressed*. You shall not force him back, and thus recognize the *right* of his master to hold him in such a condition as induces him to flee to others for protection. But it will be objected, that this command had no reference to servants among the *Israelites*, but only to those of *heathen* masters in the surrounding nations. The regulation is not restricted to any class of servants. There is no allusion to *foreign* masters, nor to the tenure by which they held their servants.

The terms of the command are unlimited. But the objection, even if valid, avails nothing—it merely shifts the pressure of the difficulty to another point, where it is just as great. For, if God arrays his infinite authority to protect the *free choice* of a *single* servant from the heathen, would he *authorize* the same persons to crush the free choice of *thousands* of servants from the heathen? Suppose a case. A *foreign* servant flees from his master to the Israelites; God speaks, "He shall dwell with thee, in that place which *he shall choose* in one of thy gates where it *liketh* him best." They were strictly charged not to put him in a condition which he did not *choose*. They were to leave him to *his own selection*. Now suppose, this same servant instead of coming into Israel of his own accord, had been *dragged* in by some kidnapper who *bought* him of his master, and now *forces* him into a condition against his will, and keeps him there till death. Would He who forbade such treatment of the stranger, who *voluntarily* came into the land, sanction the *same* treatment of the *same* person provided in *addition* to this last outrage the *previous* one had been committed of *forcing him into the nation against his will*?

To commit violence on the free choice of a *foreign* servant is a horrible enormity, forsooth, PROVIDED you *begin* the violence *after* he has come among you. But if you

commit the *first act* on the *other side of the line*; if you *begin* the outrage in good earnest by buying him from a third person *against his will*, and then tear him from home and country, and finally drag him across the line into the land of Israel, and hold him as a slave—ah! that alters the case, and you may perpetrate the violence now with impunity!! Further, does it seem probable that *greater* favor would be shown to this *new comer* from the heathen than to the *old residents*—those who had been servants in Jewish families perhaps for a generation? Were the Israelites commanded to exercise toward *him*, uncircumcised and *out of* the covenant, a justice and kindness denied to the multitudes who *were* circumcised and *within* the covenant?

Again, on the supposition that it respected merely the fugitives from the surrounding nations, while it left the servants of the Israelites in an *involuntary* condition—the objector finds small gain to his argument. In that case the surrounding nations would of course adopt retaliatory measures, and resolve themselves into so many asylums for fugitive Israelitish servants. And since these nations were on every side of them, such a proclamation would have been an effectual lure to men held in a condition which was a constant counteraction of will.

Further, on the supposition of the objector, that the *foreign* servant only is meant, it is manifest that the same command which protected him from the power of his *master*, protected him equally from the power of an *Israelite*. For the command was not merely, “Thou shalt not deliver him to his *master*,” but “he (the servant) shall dwell with thee, in that place which *he shall choose* in one of thy gates where it liketh *HIM* best.” Every Israelite was commanded to respect his free choice, and to put him in no condition *against his will*. What was this but a proclamation, that all who *chose* to live in the land and obey the laws, were left to their own free will, to dispose of their services at such a rate, to such persons, and in such places as they pleased.

Besides, grant that this command prohibited the sending back of *foreign* servants merely, was there any law requiring the return of servants who had escaped from

the *Israelites*? There was a statute requiring the return of *property* lost, and *cattle* escaped; but none requiring the return of *escaped servants*.

Finally, these verses contain, *first*, a command: "Thou shalt not deliver," &c.—*Secondly*, a declaration of the fugitive's right of *free choice*, and of God's will that he should exercise it at his own discretion; and, *thirdly*, a command guarding this right, namely, "Thou shalt not oppress him," as though God had said, If you forbid him to exercise *his own choice*, as to the place and condition of his residence it is *oppression*, and I will not tolerate it.

3. *We argue the voluntariness of servants from their peculiar opportunities and facilities for escape.* Three times every year, all the males over twelve years of age, were required to assemble from all parts of the land and celebrate the public festivals. The main body were thus absent from their homes not less than three weeks each time,—making in all nine weeks annually. As these caravans moved over the country, going and returning, were there military scouts along the whole way to intercept deserters? Was each pass of the mountains manned by a corporal's guard—the hill tops, lined with centinels, and the defiles scoured by troops of light horse? How could the Israelites contrive to take their servants three times in a year to Jerusalem and back? When a body of slaves is moved any distance in our free and equal *republic*, they are handcuffed to keep them from running away or beating their drivers' brains out. Was this the *Mosaic* plan, or an improvement introduced by Samuel, or was it left for the wisdom of Solomon? For the usage, doubtless, claims a paternity not less venerable and biblical! Perhaps they lashed their servants upon camels, and thus transported them in bundles, or caged them up, and trundled them on wheels to and fro; and then, while in attendance on the solemn festival, "lodged them in jail for safe keeping," appointing religious services *extra*, and special "ORAL instruction" for their benefit. But meanwhile, what became of the sturdy *handmaids* left at home? What hindered them from marching off in a body, if they were held *against their wills*? Perhaps the Israelitish matrons volunteered to stand sentry in rotation round the kitchens, while the young ladies

scoured the country, as mounted rangers, to pick up stragglers by day, and formed bodies of city guards to patrol the streets and keep a sharp look out at night.

4. *Their continuance in Jewish families depended upon the performance of various rites and ceremonies necessarily VOLUNTARY.*

Suppose a servant from the heathen should, upon entering a Jewish family, refuse circumcision, who does not see that the question, whether or not he shall remain a servant, is entirely in his own hands. If he was a *slave*, how simple the process of emancipation ! His *refusal* did the job. Or, suppose that, at any time, he should refuse to attend the tri-yearly feasts, or should eat leavened bread during the Passover, or compound the ingredients of the anointing oil, he is "cut off from the people" not killed, but *excommunicated*.

5. *We infer the voluntariness of the servants of the Patriarchs, from the impossibility of their being held against their wills.* The servants of Abraham are an illustration. At one time he held three hundred and eighteen *young men* who were born in his house, and probably, very many more *not* born in his house. The whole number of his servants of all ages, was probably MANY THOUSANDS. Abraham was certainly an extraordinary character, and Sarah no doubt, a most notable housekeeper ; but still, it is not easy to conceive how they contrived to hold so many thousands of servants against their wills unless (as was most likely the case) the patriarch and his wife *took turns* in performing the Hibernian exploit of surrounding them !

The neighboring tribes instead of constituting a picket guard to *hem in* his servants, would have been far more likely to deal with them, and him, as they did with Lot, when they swept him and his household into captivity. Besides, Abraham had neither "Constitution" nor "compact" nor statutes nor judicial officers to seize and send back his fugitives, nor a trained police to pounce upon panic-stricken women and children, nor gentlemen-kidnappers in the neighboring states, suing for his patronage, and volunteering to howl on the track of HUMAN game, boasting their bloodhound scent, and pledging their "honor" to hunt down and "deliver up," *provided* they had a description of the "flesh-mark," and were stimulated in their chivalry by *pieces of*

silver. Abraham seems also to have been sadly deficient in all the auxiliaries of family government, such as stocks, hand-cuffs, foot-chains, yokes, gags and thumb-screws.

This destitution of these patriarchal indispensables is the more afflicting when we consider his most faithful discharge of his responsibilities to his household though so utterly unprovided with the needful aids.

6. *We infer that persons could be held as servants only of their own accord from the fact that there is no instance either under the Patriarchal or the Mosaic system, of a master ever SELLING a servant.* Abraham had thousands of servants. We have his history in great detail but he appears never to have sold one. Isaac "grew until he became very great," and had "great store of servants." Jacob's youth was spent in Padanaram in the family of Laban, where he resided twenty one years. He was himself a servant, and had a large number of servants. No mention is made of his receiving any servants at the death of Isaac.

Many years afterwards Joseph invited Jacob to come and dwell near him in Egypt, "thou and thy children, and thy childrens' children, and thy flocks, and thy herds and ALL THAT THOU HAST." Jacob went with his flocks, and herds but *no servants*. Gen. xlv, 10: xlvii. 6: xlvii. 1—What more natural than to suppose that his servants were *voluntary*, served under their own contracts, made from time to time, and when Jacob went into Egypt, they *chose* to stay in their own country.

The government might sell *thieves*, if they had no property, until their services had made good the injury, and paid the legal fine.—Ex. xxii. 3. But *masters* seem to have had no power to sell their *servants*—the reason is obvious. To give the master a *right* to sell his servant would annihilate the servants right of choice in his own disposal—but says the objector, To give the master a *right* to *buy* a servant, equally annihilates the servants *right of choice*. Answer. It is one thing to have a right to buy a man, and a very different thing to have a right to buy that man of *another* man.

Though there is no instance in the Bible of a servant being bought of his, or her master, yet there are instances of young females who were bought of their *fathers*. But their purchase as *servants* was their betrothal as *wives*.

Exodus xxi. 7, 8.—“*If a man sell his daughter to be a maid-servant, she shall not go out as the men-servants do. If she please not her master WHO HATH BETROTHED HER TO HIMSELF, he shall let her be redeemed.**”

7. *We infer that the Hebrew servant was voluntary in COMMENCING his service, because he was preeminently so IN CONTINUING it.* If, at the year of release, it was the servant's *choice* to remain with his master rather than to leave him; so watchfully did the law guard his free will, that it was necessary for him to go through the formal process of having his ear bored by the judges of the land,—thus making it impossible for the servant to be held in an involuntary condition. Yea, so scrupulously was his *free choice* protected by the law, that it *compelled* his master to keep him, however much he might wish to get rid of him.

8. *The method prescribed by God for procuring servants, recognized their power of choice, and was an appeal to it.* He commanded the Israelites to offer them a suitable *inducement*, and then leave them to decide. They might not seize them by *force*, nor frighten them by *threats*, nor wheedle them by false pretences, nor *barrow* them, nor *beg* them, but they were commanded to *BUY* them;† that is, they were to recognize the *right* of the individuals to their own services; their right to *dispose* of them, and their right to *refuse all offers*, however tempting, and to appropriate their services in some other way. It was perfectly *optional* with the strangers, and with the Israelites, whether they should become servants or not. There was no *command* to either, to become such. They might, if they pleased, refuse all applications and all offers, however great the sum, and oblige those who made the offers, *to do their own work*. Suppose “all the nations round about,” and all the poor of the Israelites, had, with one accord, *refused* to become servants for any consideration, how could the rich

* The comment of Maimonides on this passage is as follows:

“A Hebrew handmaid might not be sold but to one who laid himself under obligation to espouse her to himself or to his son, when she was fit to be betrothed.” —*Maimonides—Hilcoth—Obedim*, Ch. IV. Sec. XI.

Jarchi, on the same passage, says, “He is bound to espouse her and take her to be his wife, for the *money of her purchase* is the money of her *espousals*.”

† The case of thieves, whose services were sold until they had earned enough to make restitution to the person wronged, and to pay the legal penalty, *stands by itself*, and has no relation to the condition of servants.

Jews have helped themselves? Answer—by *using their own services* rather than those of others who did not CHOOSE to dispose of them.

9. *Various incidental expressions throughout the Bible corroborate the idea that servants became such with their own consent, and by virtue of their own contract.* Job xli. 4, is an illustration, "*Will he (Leviathan) make a COVENANT with thee? wilt thou take him for a SERVANT forever?*"

10. *The transaction which made the Egyptians the SERVANTS OF PHARAOH, shows preeminent voluntariness throughout.* It is given in detail in Genesis xlvii. 18—26. Of their own accord, they come to Joseph and say, "*We have not aught left but our bodies and our lands, buy us;*" then in the 25th verse, "*Thou hast saved our lives: let us find grace in the sight of my Lord, and we will be servants to Pharaoh.*"

11. *We argue that the condition of servants was an OPTIONAL one, from the fact that RICH strangers did not become servants.* Indeed, so far from becoming servants themselves, *they bought and held Jewish servants.*—Lev. xxv. 47.

12. *The sacrifices and offerings which ALL were required to present, were to be made VOLUNTARILY.*—Lev. i. 2, 3.

13. *Mention is often made of persons becoming servants where they were manifestly and preeminently VOLUNTARY.* The case of the Prophet Elisha is one. 1 Kings xii. 21; 2 Kings iii. 11. Elijah was his *master*. The original word, translated master, is the same that is rendered so in almost every instance where masters are spoken of throughout the Mosaic and patriarchal system. It is translated *master* eighty-five times in our English version. Moses was the *servant* of Jethro—Exodus iii. 1. Joshua was the *servant* of Moses.—Numbers xi. 28. Jacob was the *servant* of Laban.—Genesis xxix. 18—27.

We will now consider the fourth subject of inquiry.

WERE THE SERVANTS FORCED TO WORK WITHOUT PAY?

Having already shown that the servants became and continued such of *their own accord*, it would surely be no small marvel if they *chose* to work without pay. The process by which they became servants presupposes *compensation* as a motive.

That they *were paid* for their labor, we argue

1. *Because God, under the Mosaic system, rebuked in thunder, the sin of using the labor of others without wages.* “*Wo unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness, and his chambers by wrong; that useth his neighbor’s service without wages, and giveth him not for his work.*”—Jer. xxii. 13. Here God testifies that to use the service of others without wages is “unrighteousness,” and he commissions his “wo” to burn upon the doer of the “wrong.” This “wo” was constituted by God one of the permanent safeguards of the *Mosaic system*. The Hebrew word *Reah*, here translated *neighbor*, does not mean one man, or class of men, in distinction from others, but it means *any one with whom we have to do*, native or foreigner, friend or foe, superior, inferior, or equal. To show that the Bible usage of the word requires us to include in its meaning all descriptions of persons, not merely servants and heathen, but those who prosecute us in lawsuits, and even enemies, in the act of fighting us—a few examples follow:—“*As when a man riseth against his NEIGHBOR and slayeth him,*”—Deut. xxii. 26. “*Go not forth hastily to strive lest thou know not what to do in the end thereof, when thy NEIGHBOR hath put thee to shame.*”—Prov. xxv. 8. “*Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy NEIGHBOR.*”—Exod. xx. 16. “*If any man come presumptuously upon his NEIGHBOR to slay him with guile.*”—Exod. xxi. 14. In these cases, and in scores of similar ones that might be quoted, *Reah* is the original word.

2. *We have the testimony of God, that in our duty to our fellow-men, all the law and the prophets hang upon this command, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.”* Many seem to have forgotten, that our Saviour, in giving this command, quoted *verbatim* one of the laws of the *Mosaic system*.—Lev. xix. 18. In the thirty-fourth verse of the same chapter Moses enjoins in express terms obedience to this law *in all the treatment of strangers*, “*The stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and THOU SHALT LOVE HIM AS THYSELF.*” If it is loving others *as ourselves*, to make them work for us without pay; to rob them of *food and clothing*, as well as wages, would be a stronger illustration still of the law of love, loving others *better* than ourselves! Such

is the power of disinterested benevolence! And if it is doing to others as we would have them do to us, to make them work for *our own* good alone, Paul should be called to order for his hard sayings against human nature, especially for that libellous matter in Ephes. v. 29, "*No man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it even as the Lord the Church.*"

3. *As persons became servants FROM POVERTY, we argue that they were compensated, since they frequently owned property, and sometimes a large amount.* Ziba, the servant of Mephibosheth, brought David a princely present, of his own giving, "*An hundred loaves of bread, and an hundred bunches of raisins, and an hundred of summer fruits, and a bottle of wine.*"—2 Sam. xvi. 1. The extent of his possessions can be inferred from the fact, that though he was the father of fifteen sons, he could still furnish employment for *twenty servants*, of whom he was the master.

A case is stated in Leviticus xxv. 57—59, where a servant reduced to poverty sells himself, and it is declared that afterward he may be *redeemed*, either by his kindred, or by HIMSELF. As he was forced to sell himself from sheer poverty, he must not only have *acquired* property *after* he became a servant, but a considerable sum.

If it had not been common for servants to possess, and acquire property, over which they had the exclusive control, Gehazi, the servant of Elisha, would hardly have ventured to take a large sum of money, (nearly \$3000*) from Naaman, (2 Kings v. 22, 23.) As it was procured fraudfully he was anxious to conceal the means used in getting it; but if the Isralitish servants, like our slaves, could "own nothing, nor acquire any thing," to embark in such an enterprise would have been the most consummate stupidity. The fact of his having in his possession two talents of silver, would of itself convict him of theft.† But since

* Though we have not sufficient data to enable us to decide with accuracy upon the *relative* value of that sum, *then* and *now*, yet we have enough to warrant us in saying that two talents of silver had far more *value then* than three thousand dollars have *now*.

† Whoever heard of the slaves in our southern states stealing a *large* amount of money? They "*know how to take care of themselves*" quite too well for that. When they steal they are careful to do it on such a *small* scale, or in the taking of *such things* as will make detection difficult. No doubt they steal

the possession, and use of property by servants, was common under the Mosaic system, he might have it and invest or use it, without attracting special attention. And that consideration would alone, have been a strong motive to the act. His master, who knew the whole transaction, while he rebukes him for taking such measures to get the money, not only does not take it from him, but seems to expect that he would invest it in real estate, and cattle, and in the procurement of servants.—2 Kings v. 26. In 1 Sam. ix. 8; we find that the servant of Saul had money and relieved his master in an emergency. Arza, the servant of Elah was the *owner of a house*. That it was a spacious and somewhat magnificent mansion would be a natural inference from the fact that it was a resort of the king, 1 Kings xvi. 9. The case of the Gibeonites, who, after they became servants, still occupied their cities and remained in many respects a distinct people for centuries; and that of the 150,000 Canaanites, the *servants* of Solomon, who worked out their tributes of bond-service in levies, periodically relieving each other while preparing the materials for the temple, are additional illustrations, of independence in the acquisition and ownership of property.

4. *Heirship*.—Servants frequently inherited their master's property; especially if he had no sons, or if by flagitious conduct they had dishonoured the family. This seems to have been a general usage throughout the whole Jewish history.

The cases of Eliezer, the servant of Abraham; Ziba, the servant of Mephibosheth, Jarha an Egyptian, the servant of

now and then a little, and a gaping marvel would it be if they did not. Why should not they follow in the footsteps of their masters and mistresses? Dull scholars indeed! if after so many lessons from *proficients* in the art, who drive the business by *wholesale*, they should not *occasionally* copy their betters, fall into the *fashion*, and try their hand, in a small way, at a practice which is the *only permanent and universal* business carried on around them!

Ignoble truly! never to feel the stirrings of high impulse prompting them to imitate the eminent pattern set before them in the daily vocation of "Honorable" and "Excellencies," and to emulate the illustrious examples of Doctors of Divinity and *Right and Very Reverends*! Hear President Jefferson's testimony. In his Notes on Virginia, speaking of slaves, he says, "That disposition to theft with which they (the slaves) have been branded, must be ascribed to their *situation*, and not to any special depravity of the moral sense. It is a problem which I give the master to solve, whether the religious precepts against the violation of property were not framed for him as well as for his slave—and whether the slave may not as justifiably take a *little* from one who has taken ALL from him, as he may *slay* one who would *slay* him." See Jefferson's Notes on Virginia, pp. 207-8.

Sheshan, and married to his daughter ; 1 Chron. ii. 34, 35. and of the *husbandmen* who said of their master's son "*this is the HEIR let us kill him and THE INHERITANCE WILL BE OURS.*"—Mark xii. 7, are illustrations. Also the declaration in Prov. xvii. 2.—"*A wise servant shall have rule over a son that causeth shame, and SHALL HAVE PART OF THE INHERITANCE AMONG THE BRETHREN.*" This passage seems to give *servants* a precedence as heirs, even over the *wives* and *daughters* of their masters. Now is it supposable, that masters held by force, and *plundered of their earnings*, a class of persons, from which, in contingencies often occurring, and to which families were constantly liable, they selected both heirs for their property, and husbands for their daughters?

5. *ALL were required to present offerings and sacrifices.*—Deut. xvi. 15, 17. 2 Chron. xv. 9—11. Numb. ix. 13.

Servants must have enjoyed permanently the means of *acquiring* property to meet these expenditures.

6. *Those Hebrew servants who went out at the seventh year, were provided by law with a large stock of provisions and cattle.*—Deut. xv. 12—14. *Thou shalt furnish him liberally out of thy flock, and out of thy floor, and out of thy wine press, of that wherewith the Lord thy God hath blessed thee thou shalt give him.** If it be objected, that no mention is made of the servants from the strangers, receiving a like bountiful supply, we answer neither did the most honourable class of the *Israelitish* servants, the free-holders ; and for the same reason, *they did not go out in the seventh year*, but continued until the jubilee. If the fact that no mention is made of the Gentile servants receiving when they went out such a *gratuity*, proves that they were robbed of their *earnings* ; it proves that the most valued class of *Hebrew* servants were robbed of their earnings also ; a conclusion quite too stubborn even for pro-slavery masticators, however unscrupulous.

7. *The servants were BOUGHT. In other words they received compensation for their services in advance.*

* The comment of Maimonides on this passage is as follows, "'Thou shalt furnish him liberally,' &c. That is to say '*Loading ye shall load him*' likewise every one of his family with as much as he can take with him—abundant benefits. And if it be avariciously asked '*How much must I give him?*' I say unto you *not less than thirty shekels* which is the valuation of a servant as declared in Exodus xxi. 32."—Maimonides, Hilcoth, Obedim, Chap. ii. Sec. 3.

Having shown under a previous head that the servants *sold themselves*, and of course received the compensation for themselves, (except in cases where parents hired out the time of their children until they became of age.)* A mere reference to the fact in this place is all that is required for the purposes of the argument.

8. *We infer that servants were paid, because we find masters at one time having a large number of servants and afterwards NONE without any intimation that they were sold.* The wages of servants would enable them to set up in business for themselves. Jacob, after being the servant of Laban for 21 years, became thus an independent herdsman, and was himself the master of many servants.—Gen. xxx. 43, and xxxii. 16. But all these servants had left him before he went down into Egypt having doubtless acquired enough to commence business for themselves.—Gen. xlv. 10, 11, and xlvi. 1—7, 32.

9. *God's testimony to the character of Abraham.*—Genesis xviii. 19. "*For I know him that he will command his children and his household after him, and he shall keep THE WAY OF THE LORD TO DO JUSTICE AND JUDGMENT.*" We have here God's testimony, that Abraham taught his servants "the way of the Lord." What was the will and "way of the Lord" respecting the payment of wages where service was rendered? "*Woe unto him that useth his neighbor's service without wages.*"—Jeremiah xxii 13. "*Masters give unto your servants that which is just and equal.*"—Colossians iv. 1. "*Render unto all their DUES.*"—Romans xiii. 7. "*The laborer is worthy of his hire.*"—Luke x. 7. How did Abraham teach his servants to "*do justice*" to others? By doing injustice to *them*? Did he exhort them to "render to all their dues" by keeping back *their own*? Did he teach them that "the laborer was worthy of his hire" by robbing them of *theirs*? Did he beget in his servants a reverence for the eighth commandment by wholesale thievery, as well as by the petty pilfering of all their time and labor? Did he teach them "not to go beyond or to defraud" others "in any matter" by denying *them* "what was just and equal?" If each of Abraham's pupils under such line-upon-lining, did not become a

* Among the Israelites, girls became of age at twelve and boys at thirteen years.

very *Aristides* in justice, the patriarch might still bow with submission to what was inscrutable, and be consoled by the reflection, that even the most illustrious example, adorned though it might be by patriarchal dignity, and enforced by the most thorough and *practical* lessons often avails nothing by reason of human perverseness!!

10. *Specific precepts of the Mosaic law enforcing general principles.* Out of many, we select the following:—

(1.) "*Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn,*" or literally, *while he thresheth.*—Deut. xxv. 4. Here is a general principle applied to a familiar case. The ox representing all domestic animals.—Isaiah xxx. 24. A *particular* kind of service—all kinds; and a law requiring an abundant provision for the wants of an animal ministering to man in a *certain* way,—a *general principle of treatment* covering *all times, modes, and instrumentalities of service.* The object of the law was manifestly, not merely to excite tenderness towards brutes, but to inculcate the duty of *rewarding those who serve us*, and to show that they who labor for our benefit, lay us under obligation to give them what is just and equal in return; and if such care is enjoined, by divine command, not merely for the ample sustenance, but even for the *present enjoyment* of a brute, as a suitable return for his services, what would be a meet return for the far more valuable services of *man*? MAN, with his varied wants, exalted nature and immortal destiny! Paul tells us expressly, that the principle which we have named, lies at the bottom of the statute. See 1 Corinthians ix. 9, 10.—"*For it is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen? Or saith he it altogether for our sakes? that he that ploweth should plow in HOPE, and that he that thresheth in hope should be PARTAKER OF HIS HOPE.*"

(2.) *If thy brother be waxen poor, and fallen in decay with thee, then thou shalt relieve him, YEA, THOUGH HE BE A STRANGER OR A SOJOURNER, that he may live with thee. Take thou no usury of him, or increase, but fear thy God. Thou shalt not give him thy money upon usury, nor lend him thy victuals for increase.*—Leviticus xxv. 35—37. Or, in other words, thou shalt not take advantage of his necessities, nor make his poverty a pecuniary specu-

lation. He is entitled to *belief* at your hands. It is *his right* and *your duty*. Now we ask by what process of proslavery legerdemain or syllogism run mad, this benevolent regulation can be made to appear in harmonious *keeping*, with the doctrine of WORK WITHOUT PAY while life lasts. God here declares the *claim* of the poor stranger upon their pity, and his *right* to their RELIEF. And did He, in the same breath, *authorize* them to seize this same stranger and "*use his services without wages*;"—force him to work for them and ROB HIM OF ALL HIS EARNINGS? The supposition is blasphemous. It makes Deity an infinite contradiction and absurdity.

We now proceed to the fifth subject of inquiry.

WERE MASTERS THE PROPRIETORS OF SERVANTS AS THEIR LEGAL PROPERTY?—IN OTHER WORDS, WAS THE SERVANT'S RIGHT TO HIS OWN POWERS, THEIR CUSTODY, USE, AND DISPOSAL ANNULLED BY THE SUPERIOR CLAIM OF THE MASTER?

This subject has already been indirectly discussed, and the question virtually answered under the preceding heads; but a variety of considerations bearing upon it, and not within the range of our previous inquiries, should not be omitted even in sketching an "outline."

We argue, then, that servants were not held as the property of their masters.

1. *Because they were not applied to the uses, nor subject to the contingencies of property.*

(1.) *They were never taken nor offered in payment for their masters' debts*, though children were sometimes taken (without legal authority) for the debts of a father.—2 Kings iv. 1; Job. xxiv. 9; Isa. l. 1; Matt. xviii. 25.

Cases are recorded in which creditors took from debtors property of all kinds, to satisfy their demands against them.

In Job xxiv. 3, cattle are taken; in Prov. xxii. 27, household furniture; in Lev. xxv. 25—28, the productions of the soil; in Lev. xxv. 27—30, houses; in Exod. xxii. 26—29, and Deut. xxiv. 10—13, and Matt. v. 40, clothing; but *servants* were taken in *no instance*.

(2.) *Servants were never given as pledges. Property*

of all sorts was given and held in pledge. We find in various parts of the Bible household furniture, clothing, oxen, asses, sheep, cattle, money, signets, and personal ornaments, with divers other articles of property used as pledges for value received. But no *servants*.

(3.) *All lost PROPERTY was to be restored.* Oxen, asses, sheep, raiment, and "whatever lost things" are specified—*servants not*.—Deut. xxii. 13. Besides, the Israelites were expressly forbidden to take back the runaway servant to his master.—Deut. xxiii. 15.

(4.) *The Israelites never gave away their servants as presents*, yet their presents had great variety. Lands, asses, oxen, houses, mules, sheep, gold, silver, precious stones, vessels, raiment, ivory, ebony, all kinds of fruit and grain, in large quantities; images, idols, spices, and armor, are but few of the articles specified which were at different times presented to others as *gifts*. They made presents often, and princely ones. It was a standing usage to give presents to superiors and persons of rank when visiting them, and at other times.—1 Sam. x. 27; 1 Sam. xvi. 20; 2 Chron. xvii. 5. Abraham to Abimelech, Gen. xxi. 27; Jacob to the viceroy of Egypt, Gen. xliii. 11; Joseph to his brethren and father, Gen. xlv. 22, 23; Benhadad to Elisha, 2 Kings viii. 8, 9; Ahaz to Tiglath Pilezer, 2 Kings vi. 8; Solomon to the Queen of Sheba, 1 Kings x. 13; Jeroboam to Ahijah, 1 Kings xiv. 3; Asa to Benhadad, 1 Kings xv. 18, 19. Besides, *giving servants*, was a prevailing fashion in the surrounding nations.—Gen. xii. 16; Gen. xx. 14.

OBJECTION 1. *Laban gave handmaids to his daughters, Jacob's wives.* Without enlarging on the nature of the polygamy then prevalent, it is enough to say that the handmaids of wives, at that time, were themselves regarded as wives, though of inferior dignity and authority. That Jacob regarded his handmaids in that light, is proved by his curse upon Reuben, (Gen. xlix. 4, and 1 Chron. v. 1,) also by the perfect equality of their children with those of Rachel and Leah. But if it had been otherwise, and Laban had given them *as articles of property*, then, indeed, the example of this "good old patriarch and slaveholder," Saint Laban, would have been a fore-closer to all argument.

Ah ! we remember his jealousy for *religion*—his holy indignation when he found that his “GODS” were stolen ! How he mustered his clan, and plunged over the desert in hot pursuit, seven days, by forced marches ; how he ransacked a whole caravan, sifting the contents of every tent, little heeding such small matters as domestic privacy, or female seclusion, for lo ! the zeal of his “IMAGES” had eaten him up !

No wonder that slavery, in its Bible-navigation, drifting dismantled before the free gusts, should scud under the lee of such an ancient and pious worthy to haul up and refit ; claiming his protection, and invoking the benediction of his “GODS !”

OBJECTION 2. “*Servants were enumerated in inventories of property.*” Hence it is inferred that servants were the property of their masters. They were included among houses, camels, asses, oxen, sheep, raiment, silver, gold, and all sorts of goods and chattels. But if that proves them property, it proves *wives* property. “*Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s WIFE, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbor’s.*”—Exod. xx. 17. This is done too in a legal code, a compend of universal rules, where we should expect to find, if any where, the conjunction of things that belong together. Further, an examination of all the places in which servants are included among beasts, chattels, &c., will show that where there is an inventory of mere property, *servants* are not included, or if included, it is in such a way as to show that they are not regarded in the light of *property*.—Eccl. ii. 7, 8. But when the design is to show, not merely the wealth but the *greatness* of any personage, that he is a man of distinction, and sway, a ruler, a prince, his servants are spoken of as well as his property. In a word, if *riches* alone are spoken of no mention is made of servants ; if *greatness*, servants and property.—Gen. xiii. 2. “*And Abraham was very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold.*” No mention is made of *servants*. So in the fifth verse Lot’s riches are enumerated, “*And Lot also had flocks, and herds, and tents.*” In the seventh verse *servants* are mentioned, “*And there was a strife between the HERDMEN of Abraham’s cattle*

and the HERDMEN of Lot's cattle." For additional illustrations see Josh. xxii. 8; Gen. xxxiv. 23; Job. xlii. 12; 2 Chron. xxi. 3; xxxii. 27—29; Job. i. 3—5; Deut. viii. 12—17; Gen. xxiv. 35, and xxvi. 13, and xxx. 43.

Divers facts dropped in accidentally corroborate this idea, and show that when servants are mentioned in connection with property, it is in such a way as to *distinguish* them from it. When Jacob was about to leave Laban his wives say to him, "All the *riches* which thou hast taken from our father, that is ours and our children's." Then follows an inventory of property. "All his cattle," "all his goods," "the cattle of his getting," &c. He had a large number of servants at the time, *but they ARE not included among his goods and property.* Compare Gen. xxx. 43, with Gen. xxxi. 16—18.

A few days afterwards, when he sent messengers to advertise Esau of his approach, in order to secure his respect, and impress him with an idea of his state and sway, he told them to inform him not only of *his RICHES*, but of his GREATNESS.—Gen. xxxii. 4, 5. They were to tell Esau that Jacob had "*oxen, and asses, and flocks, and men-servants, and maid-servants.*"

Yet in the present which he sent there were no servants; though he seems to have labored to give as much variety to it as possible.—Gen. xxxii. 14, 15; see also Gen. xxxvi. 6, 7; Gen. xxxiv. 23. As flocks and herds were the *staples* of wealth at that period, a large number of servants in the household of a patriarch *presupposed* very large possessions of cattle, the tending of which would require many herdsmen. It is also worthy of notice that when servants are spoken of in connection with *mere property*, those terms in the original which are used to express the latter do not include the former.

The Hebrew word *Mickna* is an illustration. It is a derivative of *Kaunau*, to procure, to buy, and its general meaning is a possession, purchase, property. It is most commonly used in the Bible to designate that kind of property called by our farmers "live stock," as flocks, herds, and all descriptions of animals *for the use of man.* This word is used more than forty times in the Old Testament. In a *few* instances it includes real estate and goods, but generally things that *have life* and are owned by man.

We find no instance in which it includes *servants*, and in some instances they are expressly named in *distinction* from *Mickna*.

This principle is illustrated in the account of Abram's migration from Haran to Canaan.—Gen. xii. 5. “*And Abraham took Sarah his wife, and Lot his brother's Son. And all their SUBSTANCE that they had gathered. And the souls that they had gotten in Haran, and they went forth to go into the land of Canaan, and into the land of Canaan they came.*” *Substance gathered and souls gotten!* It is not a little marvellous, since such pains is taken by inspiration to separate the souls from the substance here, that it should be strenuously insisted upon that *they* constituted a part of the *substance*. That they were Abram's property—*slaves* that had probably been taken captive in war, and were now by right of conquest, taken with him in his migration as a part of his family effects. Who but slaveholders, either actually, or in heart, could ever dream that the expression, “*the souls that they had gotten*” contained the principle of slavery, and described the practice.

What more humiliating than that perversion, of the mind of the church, produced by its contact with slavery ever since the African slave trade breathed its haze upon her vision, and smote her with palsy and decay? Previous to that time, commentators saw no slavery in the expression, “*The souls that they had gotten.*”

In the Targum of Onkelos* it is thus rendered, “*The souls whom they had brought to obey the law in Haran.*” In the Targum of Jonathan thus, “*The souls whom they had made proselytes in Haran.*” In the Targum of Jerusalem, “*The souls proselyted in Haran.*” Jarchi, placed by Jewish Rabbis at the head of their commentators, thus renders it, “*The souls whom they had brought under the Divine wings,*” Jerome, one of the most learned of the

* The Targums are Chaldee paraphrases of parts of the Old Testament. The Targum of Onkelos is for the most part, a very accurate and faithful translation of the original, and was probably made at about the commencement of the Christian era. The Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel bears about the same date. The Targum of Jerusalem was probably about 500 years later.

The Israelites during their long captivity in Babylon, lost as a body, their knowledge of their own language. These translations of the Hebrew Scriptures into the Chaldee, the language which they acquired in Babylon, were thus called for by the necessity of the case.

Christian fathers,—“The persons whom he had proselyted.” The Persian version thus gives the whole verse, “And Abraham took Sarah his wife, and Lot his brother’s son, and all their wealth which they had accumulated, and the souls which they had *made*.” The Vulgate version thus translates it, “Universam substantiam quam possederant et animas quas fecerant in Haran.” “The entire wealth which they possessed, and the souls which they had made.” The Syriac thus, “All their possessions which they possessed and the souls which they had made in Haran.” The Arabic “All their property which they had acquired, and the souls whom they had made in Haran.” The Samaritan version, “All the wealth which they had gathered, and the souls which they had made in Haran.” Menochius a commentator who wrote before our present translation of the English Bible, renders it as follows:—“Quas de idolotria converterunt.”* Those whom they had converted from idolatry.”—Paulus Fagius.† “Quas instituerant in religione.”—“Those whom they had instructed in religion.”—Luke Francke, a German commentator who lived two centuries ago. “Quas legi subicerant.”—“Those whom they had brought to obey the Law.”

2. *The condition of servants in their masters’ families, the affection and respect exercised toward them, the rights and privileges which they shared in common with the children and their recognition as equals, not only by the household, but by persons filling the highest offices of the government—make the doctrine that they were mere ARTICLES and COMMODITIES, an absurdity.* The testimony of the Apostle Paul in Gal. iv. 1, gives us an insight into the condition of servants in Hebrew families. “Now I say unto you that the heir so long as he is a child DIFFERETH NOTHING FROM A SERVANT, though he be Lord of all.”

It has been already shown that the servants of Abraham must have been preeminently voluntary,—it is just as plain that their interests were identified inseparably with those of their master’s family—that they were regarded with

* See his “Brevis explicatio sensus literalis totius Scripturæ.”

† This eminent Hebrew scholar was invited to England by Cranmer, then Archbishop of Can’erbury, to superintend the translation of the Bible into English, under the patronage of Henry the Eighth. He had hardly commenced the work when he died. This was nearly a century before the date of our present translation.

great affection by the household, and that the utmost confidence was reposed in them. This is shown in the arming of 318 of them, for the purpose of recovering Lot and his family from captivity.—See Genesis xiv. 14, 15.

When Eliezer, the servant of Abraham, went to Padan-aram, the young Princess Rebekah did not disdain to say to him, "Drink, MY LORD," as "she hasted and let down her pitcher upon her hand, and gave him drink," and added, "I will draw water for thy camels also, until they have done drinking." And, good as her word, "she hasted and emptied her pitcher, and ran again unto the well and drew for all his camels." Laban also, the brother of Rebekah, *himself* prepares the house for his reception, and "room for the camels." He then *ungirded his camels* and gave them straw and provender, *and brought him "water to wash his feet and the men's feet that were with him!"* and this too after he had declared that Abraham was his *master*.

In the 9th chapter of 1 Samuel, we have an account of a high festival held in the city of Zuph, at which Samuel, the chief judge and ruler in Israel presided. We are informed that none sat down at the feast except those that were bidden. And that only about *thirty* persons were bidden. Quite a select party!—the elite of the city of Zuph! Saul, afterward King of Israel, and his servant, on a journey, arrived at Zuph just as the guests were assembling; and *both* of them at Samuel's express solicitation, accompany him to the place of celebration as invited guests. Samuel having previously given intimation to Saul, that he was about to be set apart by God, as the King of Israel. "*And Samuel took Saul and his SERVANT, and brought THEM into the PARLOR, (!) and made THEM sit in the CHIEFEST SEATS among those that were bidden.*" A servant invited by the chief judge, ruler, and prophet in Israel, to a select public dinner in company with his *master who was at the same time anointed King of Israel*; and this servant introduced by Samuel into the PARLOR and assigned, with his master, to the *chiefest seat* or most honorable place at the table! From the third verse of the chapter, it seems that this was "*one of the servants*" of Kish, Saul's father, not the *steward* or the *chief* of them—not at all a *picked* man, but *one of the servants*;" *any* one that could be spared most easily, as no endowments specially rare would be

likely to be put in requisition in the business of looking after asses.

Again ; we learn from 1 Kings xvi. 8, 9, that Elah, the King of Israel, was slain by Zimri, one of his chief officers, at a festive entertainment, in the house of Arza, his steward or head servant, with whom, as a natural inference from the circumstances, he seems to have been on terms of the utmost familiarity, and, virtually, of equality. Without giving in detail other cases, as those already drawn out sufficiently sustain the position. We refer the reader to the intercourse between Gideon and his servant.—Judges vii. 10, 11.—Jonathan and his servant. 1 Samuel xiv. 1—14.—Elisha and his servant.

3. *The condition of the Gibeonites as subjects of the Hebrew commonwealth, shows that they were not held as articles of property—as chattels personal or real, nor even as INVOLUNTARY servants.* The treatment of these Gibeonites, or rather of the inhabitants of Gibeon, Chephirah, Beeroth, and Kirjathjearim, and their condition under the Israelites, is often quoted in triumph by the advocates of slavery ; and truly they are right welcome to all the crumbs of consolation that can be gleaned from it. Milton's devils made desperate snatches at fruit that turned to ashes on their lips. The spirit of slavery raves under tormenting gnawings, and casts about in blind phrenzy for something to ease or even to mock them. But for this, it would never have clutched at the Gibeonites, for even the incantations of the demon cauldron, could not extract from their case enough to tantalize starvation's self. But to the question. What was the condition of the Gibeonites under the Israelites ?

(1.) *It was voluntary.* Their own proposition to Joshua, at the outset, was to become servants.—Joshua ix. 8, 11. Manifestly knowing the directions in Deuteronomy xx. 11, since they were so well versed in other minute facts of their history. Their proposition was accepted, and they were received as servants, but the kind of service which they should perform was not specified until their gross imposition upon the Israelites came to light ; then they assigned them to the performance of menial offices in the tabernacle. This assignment Joshua calls *cursing* them.

(2.) *They were not domestic servants in the families of the Israelites.* They still continued to reside in their own

cities, occupying the same houses, cultivating the same fields, tending their flocks, and herds, and exercising all the functions of a *distinct*, though not independent community. They were *subject* to the Jewish nation as *tributaries*; and their tribute seems to have been a certain amount of personal service rendered at the tabernacle, in lieu of a payment in money, or in the produce of their soil, flocks and herds. So far from being dispersed among the people of Israel, their family and social relations broken up, and their internal organization as a distinct people abolished, they seem to have remained a separate, and, in some respects, an independent community for many centuries, if not throughout the Jewish history. When they were attacked by the Amorites, they applied to the Israelites as confederates for aid, it was rendered with great promptness, their enemies routed, and themselves left unmolested in the occupation of their cities, while Joshua and all Israel returned into camp at Gilgal.—Joshua x. 6—18. Some centuries afterwards, Saul slew some of them, and God sent upon Israel a three years' famine for it. David called the Gibeonites and said unto them, "What shall I do for you, and wherewith shall I make the atonement, that ye may bless the inheritance of the Lord?" And, at their demand, he surrendered up to them seven of the royal family, and five of them the sons of Michal, his own former wife.—2 Samuel xxi. 1—9. The whole transaction is a public and formal recognition of the Gibeonites as a separate people. There is not the least intimation in their history that they ever performed any services for the families, or for individuals of the Israelites, but only for the "house of God" or the Tabernacle. This was established first at Gilgal, a day's journey from the cities of the Gibeonites; and then at Shiloh, nearly two days' journey from them; where it continued until the time of Samuel, nearly 350 years. During all this period the Gibeonites inhabited their ancient cities and territory. It is plain that only a few, comparatively, were absent from their cities at any one time in attendance on the tabernacle.

(1.) When ever allusion is made to them in the history, the main body are spoken of as at home.

(2.) It is preposterous to suppose that the kind of service in which they were engaged about the tabernacle, could have furnished employment for all the inhabitants of these

four cities, when we are told that one of them "was a great city as one of the royal cities;" so large, indeed, that a confederacy of five kings, apparently among the most powerful in the land, was deemed necessary for its destruction. From all the facts in the case, it is probable that the men were divided into classes, and that these classes ministered at the tabernacle in rotation—each class, perhaps a few days, or weeks at a time. This service was their *national tribute* to the Israelites; the equivalent which they were required to render, for the privilege of residence and protection, under their government. The female Gibeonites do not seem to have been required to render *the least service of any kind to the Israelites*. Since these Gibeonites were Canaanites, and since, in addition to their iniquity as Canaanites, whose cup was full, they had superadded the most public, deliberate, and formal hypocrisy and lying, and provoked, almost beyond endurance, Joshua and the Israelites by impudent imposition, we might assuredly expect to see the Israelites reduce *them* to the condition of chattels and property and so *hold* them, if there was *any* case in which God permitted them to do so.

Finally, we argue that the Israelites were not permitted to hold their servants as their *property*.

7. *Because, throughout the Mosaic system, God warns them against holding their servants in such a condition, as they were held in by the Egyptians.* Every reader of the Pentateuch, remembers the denunciations against those who should dare to hold their servants under such a system as the bondage in Egypt. How often are the Israelites pointed back to the grindings of their prison-house! What motives to the exercise of justice and kindness towards their servants, are held out to their fears in threatened judgments; to their hopes in promised good; and to all within them that could feel, by those oft repeated words of tenderness and terror! "For ye were bondmen in the land of Egypt"—waking anew the memory of tears and anguish, and of the wrath that avenged them.

That the argument derived from the condition of the Israelites in Egypt, and God's condemnation of it, may be fully appreciated, it is important that the Egyptian bondage should be analyzed. We shall then be able to ascertain, of

what rights the Israelites were plundered, and what they retained; and can determine satisfactorily whether they were articles of property, and "chattels personal" unable "to own any thing or acquire any thing;" as say the laws of our southern states respecting their slaves.

EGYPTIAN BONDAGE ANALYZED. (1.) *It is plain that the Israelites were not domestic slaves, the property of individual owners,* and dispersed among the families of Egypt;* They manifestly formed a *separate* community. Gen. xlv. 35. Ex. viii. 22, 24. and ix. 26. and x. 23. and xi. 7. and ii. 9. and xvi. 22. and xvii. 5.

(2.) *The Israelites had the exclusive possession of the land of Goshen one of the most rich and productive parts of Egypt,* Gen. xlv. 18, and xlvii. 6, 11, 27. Ex. xii. 4, 19, 22, 23, 27.

(3.) *They lived in permanent dwellings.* These were *houses*, not *tents*. In Ex. xii. 6. the two side *posts*, and the upper door *posts* of the houses are mentioned, and in the 22d the two side posts, and the lintel. Each family seems to have possessed a house *by itself*—Acts vii. 20. Ex. xii. 4.—and from the regulation about the eating of the Passover, their houses could hardly have been small ones.—Ex. xii. 4.—and probably contained separate apartments, and places for seclusion.—Ex. ii. 2, 3. Acts vii. 20. Household utensils are incidentally mentioned.—Ex. xii. 22, 34. The people appear to have been well apparelled.—Ex. xii. 11. To have had their own burial grounds.—Ex. xiii. 19, and xiv. 11.

(4.) *They possessed "a mixed multitude of flocks and herds, and "very much cattle."*—Ex. xii. 32, 37, 38.

(5.) They were not only a *distinct* community, but had their own form of government, and their own rulers, and preserved their tribe and family divisions, and their internal

* The Egyptians evidently had *domestic* servants living in their families; these in all probability were *slaves*; allusion is made to them in Exodus ix. 14, 20, 21. But none of the Israelites were included in this class.

† The land of Goshen was a large tract of country, east of the Pelusian arm of the Nile, and between it, and the head of the Red Sea, and the lower border of Palestine. The probable centre of that portion, occupied by the Israelites, could hardly have been less than sixty miles from the city, from the best authorities it would seem that the extreme western boundary of Goshen must have been many miles distant from Egypt. See "Exodus of the Israelites out of Egypt," an able article by Professor Robinson in the Biblical Repository for October 1832.

organization throughout ; though still a province of Egypt, and *tributary* to it. Ex. ii. 1, and xii. 19, 21, and vi. 14. 25, and v. 19. and iii. 16. 18.

(6.) *They seem to have had in a considerable measure the disposal of their own time*,—Ex. xxiii. 4. and iii. 16, 18, and xii. 6, and ii. 9. and iv. 27, 29—31. Also to have practised the fine arts. Ex. xxxii. 4. and xxxv. 32—35.

(7.) *They were all armed*. Ex. xxxii. 27.

(8.) *All the females seem to have been accomplished in what were deemed domestic refinements; they were familiar with instruments of music, and were skilled in the working of fine fabrics*. Ex. xv. 20. and xxxv. 36.

(9.) *They held their possessions independently, and Pharaoh, and the Egyptians seem to have regarded them as inviolable*. This we infer from the fact that in the minute history of the sojourn in Egypt, and although the most specific reference is made, throughout the Bible, to their oppressive exactions upon the Israelites, there is no where an intimation, that the Egyptians in a single instance, dispossessed them of their habitations, or took away their flocks, or herds, or crops, or implements of agriculture, or any article of property.

(10.) *Service seems to have been exacted from none but adult males*. The Israelitish females appear to have been wholly exempt. Not only is nothing said from which their bond-service could be inferred ; but the hiding of Moses three months by his mother, and the payment of wages to her by Pharaoh's daughter, go altogether against such a supposition.—Ex. ii. 29.

(11.) So far from being kept upon a given allowance of sustenance, they had no restrictions in their food, it was abundant and had great variety. "They sat by the flesh-pots," and "did eat bread to the full." Ex. xvi. 3, and xxiv. 1, and xvii. 5, and iv. 29, and vi. 14. Also, "they did eat fish freely, and cucumbers, and melons, and leeks, and onions, and garlic." Num. xi. 4, 5, and x. 18, and xx. 5.

(12.) *That the great body of the people were not in the service of the Egyptians we infer* (1) from the fact, that the extent, and variety, of their own possessions, together with such a cultivation of their crops, as would provide them with bread, and such an amount of care over their immense

flocks and herds, as would secure their profitable increase, (as was indisputably the fact,) must have furnished constant employment for the main body of the nation.

(2.) During the plague of darkness God informs us that ALL the children of Israel had light in their habitations. We infer that they were *there* to enjoy it.

(3.) It seems incredible that the making of brick, the only service named during the latter part of their sojourn in Egypt, could have furnished permanent employment for the bulk of the nation. For probable evidence that the main body was at home see Ex. iv. 29—31.

Besides, according to the customs of Eastern nations, then, as now, where they employed tributaries, it was in the use of the levy, requiring them to furnish a given quota, to be drafted off periodically, or by division into classes, and service in rotation, so that comparatively but a small portion of the nation would be absent *at any one time*.

Probably there was the same requisition upon the Israelites for one fifth part of their labor, that was laid upon the Egyptians. See Gen. xlvii. 24, 26. They would not be likely to treat strangers, supported through the famine, better than their own people. Instead of taking it out of their *crops*, (as Goshen was better for *pasturage* than crops) they exacted it of them in brick making ; and it is quite probable that only the *poorer* Israelites were required to work for the Egyptians at all, the wealthier being able to pay their tribute in money. See Exod. iv. 27—31.

This was the bondage in Egypt. Let it be compared with American slavery. Have our slaves "very much cattle," and "a mixed multitude of flocks and herds?" Do they possess commodious houses of their own? Do they "*sit by the flesh pots,*" "*eat fish freely,*" and "*eat bread to the full?*" Do they live by themselves in a separate community, at a distance from their masters, in their distinct tribes, each with its own well-defined subdivisions, under their own rulers and officers? Have they the exclusive occupation of an extensive and fertile tract of country for the culture of their own crops, and for the rearing of immense herds of *their own* cattle—and all these held independently of their masters, and regarded by them as inviolable? Are the female slaves of the South free from all exactions of labor and liabilities of outrage—and whenever

employed, are they paid wages, as was the Israelitish woman, when employed by the king's daughter?—Exod. ii. 9. (This is the only instance of a *female* Israelite performing service for an Egyptian.) Have the females entirely, and the males to a considerable extent, the disposal of their own time? Have they leisure, and the means for cultivating social refinements, for practising the fine arts, and for intellectual and moral improvement?

THE ISRAELITES UNDER THE BONDAGE OF EGYPT ENJOYED ALL THESE RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES.

True, they suffered grievous exactions of labor, and were cruelly driven beyond their strength. True, "*their lives were made bitter, and all the service wherein they made them serve was with rigor.*" But what was all this when compared with the incessant toil of the slaves in our slave states, the robbery of all their time, and earnings, and even the "power to own any thing, or acquire any thing"—the "quart of corn a-day," the legal allowance of food!—their *only* clothing for one half the year, "*one shirt and one pair of pantaloons!*"†—the *two hours and a half* only for rest and refreshment in the twenty-four!—their dwellings, *hovels* unfit for human residence, commonly with but one apartment, where both sexes and all ages herd promiscuously at night, like the beasts of the field.‡ Add to this the mental ignorance, and moral degradation; the daily separations of kindred, the revelries of lust, the lacerations and baptisms of blood, sanctioned by the laws of the South, and patronized by its public sentiment. What, we ask, was the bondage of Egypt compared with this? And yet for *her* oppression of the poor God smote her with his plagues, and made her drunk with his fury, and trampled her as the mire, till she passed away in his wrath, and the place that knew her in her pride knew her no more. Ah! "*I have seen, I have seen,*" said God, "*the afflictions of my people, and I have heard their groanings, and am come down to deliver them.*" He *did* come, and "before him went the pestilence, and devouring fire went forth at his feet," as he marched over Egypt in indignation, and

* The law of South Carolina. See Haywood's Manual, 524—5.

† The law of Louisiana. See Martin's Digest, 610.

‡ The whole amount of time secured to slaves by the law of Louisiana. See Act of July 7, 1806. Martin's Digest, 610—12.

threshed her in his anger till she sank amidst her ruinous heaps, and her blood closed over her.

If such was God's retribution for the oppressions of heathen Egypt, sitting in the region and shadow of death, of how much sorer punishment shall a Christian people be thought worthy, who in the mid-day of the Gospel, and on the confines of the millenium, legalize and cloak with religion a system, in comparison with which the bondage of Egypt dwindles to nothing.

We say, in conclusion, under this head, let those believe who can, that God gave his people permission to hold human beings, robbed of *all* their rights, while he threatened them with the direst judgments if they practised the *far lighter* oppression of Egypt—which robbed its victims of only the *least* and *cheapest* of their rights, and left the *females* unplundered even of these. What! *Is God divided against himself?* When he had just strewed Egypt with carnage; while his curse yet blazed upon her unburied dead, and his bolts still hissed amidst her slaughter, and her ruins smouldered a funeral pile, and the smoke of her torment went upwards because she had “ROBBED THE POOR,” did He license the VICTIMS of robbery to rob the poor of ALL? As *Lawgiver* did he *create* a system tenfold more grinding than that for which he had just hurled Pharaoh headlong, and cloven down his princes, and overwhelmed his hosts, and blasted them with His thunder, till “hell was moved to meet them at their coming?”

Having touched upon the general topics of inquiry which we design to include in this “Outline,” we proceed to consider various facts and Scripture passages, which will doubtless be set in array against the foregoing conclusions.

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

The advocates of slavery are never so much at their wits ends as when they try to press the Bible into their service. Every movement shows that they are hard pushed. Their odd conceits and ever varying shifts, their forced constructions, lacking even plausibility, their bold assumptions, and blind guesswork, not only proclaim their *cause* desperate, but themselves. Some of the Bible defences

set up for slavery by ministers of the Gospel, do so torture common sense, Scripture, and historical fact, that it were hard to tell whether absurdity, fatuity, ignorance, or blasphemy predominate in the compound. Each strives so lustily for the mastery, that it may be set down a drawn battle.

How often has it been set up in type, that the color of the negro is the mark put upon Cain, and by him propagated downward. No doubt his posterity started an opposition to the ark, and rode out the flood in style! Why should not a miracle be wrought to point such an argument, to perpetuate the *Cain mark* through time—proclaim the negro for ever accursed, and thus fill out for slaveholders a title-deed of Divine origin, vindicating the ways of God to men, and setting forth that slavery came down from heaven, a good and perfect gift from the Father of lights, and having fulfilled its labor of love, thither will again return.

OBJECTION 1. "*Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren.*"—Gen. i. 25.

This prophecy of Noah respecting Canaan's posterity has always been the vade mecum of slaveholders, and they never venture abroad without it. It is a pocket-piece to show on sudden occasion—a keepsake to dote over—a charm to spell-bind opposition, and a magnet to draw around their standard atheists and scoffers. Indeed it serves them such a variety of vital purposes, that the inventory of their armor, offensive and defensive, arranged in rhetorical order, would wear in all weathers as a crown to the climax, "*Cursed be Canaan.*" But closely as they cling to it, many a slaveholder has found "*cursed be Canaan*" a poor drug to stupify a throbbing conscience—a mocking lullaby, vainly wooing slumber to unquiet tossings, that like the troubled sea, can find no rest, and screaming "*peace, be still,*" where God wakes war, and breaks his thunders.

Those who plead the curse on Canaan, in justification of negro slavery, *assume* as usual all the points in debate.

1. That the condition prophesied of Canaan was *slavery* in any sense, rather than the mere *rendering of service* to superiors, and that it was the bondage of *individuals* to others rather than the condition of a *nation tributary* to another, and in *that* sense its *servant*. Not only is the

passage equally susceptible of the latter construction, but it is in strict conformity with Scripture usage.

ASSUMPTION 2. That the *prediction* of crime is its *justification*, if not its *sanctification*; that it at least grants absolution to those whose crimes fulfil it, if it does not transform the crimes themselves into *virtues*. On this principle how piously the Pharaohs might have quoted God's prophecy to Abraham, "*Thy seed shall be in bondage, and they shall afflict them four hundred years.*" And then what *saints* were those that crucified the Lord of glory!

ASSUMPTION 3. That the Africans were descended from Canaan. Whereas it is notorious that Africa was peopled from Egypt and Ethiopia, and that Mizraim settled Egypt and Cush Ethiopia.

The location of Canaan's posterity with its boundaries is given very minutely in Gen. x. 15—19. So on the assumption that African slavery is the fulfilment of the prophecy, the objector quotes a curse pronounced upon one nation, to justify its infliction upon another. Perhaps it may be argued that Canaan is used in the passage as the representative of all Ham's posterity. If so, the prophecy has not been fulfilled. The other sons of Ham settled the Egyptian and Assyrian empires, and conjointly with Shem the Persian, and afterward to some extent (though not mainly) the Grecian and Roman. If the history of these nations furnishes any verification of the prophecy, it must be in particulars not yet brought to the knowledge of the world. Whereas the history of the descendants of Canaan, for more than three thousand years, exhibits the prophecy in an unbroken process of fulfilment. 1st. They were conquered and made tributaries by the Israelites. Then Canaan was the servant of Shem. Afterward they were brought under tribute by the Medes and Persians. Then Canaan was the servant of Shem, and in part of the other sons of Ham. Afterward by the Macedonians, Grecians, and Romans successively. Then Canaan was the servant of Japhet, mainly and secondarily of the other sons of Ham, and finally by the Ottoman dynasty, where they yet remain, and thus Canaan is *now* the servant of Shem and Japhet and the other sons of Ham.

But it may still be objected, that though Canaan is the

only one *named* in the curse, it cannot refer specially to him, but to the posterity of Ham in general, and thus recognise negro slavery; and the 22d and 23d verses are quoted to support the idea. "*And Ham the father of Canaan saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brethren without.*"—Verse 22. In verse 23, Shem and Japhet cover their father with a garment. In verse 24, as follows, *And Noah awoke from his wine and knew what his YOUNGER son had done unto him, and said, &c.*

It is argued that the *younger* son here spoken of cannot be *Canaan*, as he was not the *son* but the *grandson* of Noah, and therefore it must refer to *Ham*. We answer, Whoever that "*younger son*" was, or whatever he did, *Canaan* was the only one named in the curse, "*Cursed be Canaan,*" etc. But the objection has no force. The Hebrew word *Ben*, signifies son, grandson, great grandson, or *any one* of the posterity of an individual. Gen. xxix. 5. *And he said unto them know ye Laban the son of Nahor?*

Yet Laban was the *grandson* of Nahor.—Gen. xxiv. 15, 29. In 2 Sam. xix. 24. It is said, *Mephibosheth the son of Saul came down to meet the king.* But Mephibosheth was the son of Jonathan, and the *grandson* of Saul. 2. Sam. ix. 6. So Ruth iv. 17. *There is a SON born to Naomi.* This was the son of Ruth, the daughter in law of Naomi, and consequently her legal *grandson*.—Ruth iv. 13, 15. So 2 Sam. xxi. 6. *Let seven men of his (Saul's) sons, be delivered unto us &c.* This demand was answered by the delivery of seven of Saul's *grandsons*.—2 Sam. xxi. 8. 9. So Gen. xxxi. 28. *And hast not suffered me to kiss my sons and my daughters,* and in the 55th verse, "*And early in the morning Laban rose up and kissed his sons, &c.*" The context shews that they were his *grandsons*. So 2 Kings ix. 20. *The driving of Jehu the son of Nimshi.* So 1 Kings xix. 16. But Jehu was the son of Jehoshaphat and the *grandson* of Nimshi. 2 Kings ix. 2, 14. After these instances, who will forbid the inspired writer to use the *same* word when speaking of *Noah's grandson*.

Further if Ham were meant, what propriety in calling him the *younger* son.

The order in which Noah's sons are always mentioned, makes Ham the *second*, and not the *younger* son. If it be objected that Bible usage is variable, and that the order of

birth is not always observed in family enumerations, the reply is, that, enumeration in the order of birth is the *rule*, in any other order the *exception*. Besides if the younger member of a family takes precedence of older ones in the family record, it is a mark of pre-eminence either in original endowments or providential instrumentality. As in the case of Abraham, who though sixty years younger than his eldest brother, and probably the youngest of Terah's sons stands first in the family genealogy. Nothing in Ham's history warrants the idea of his pre-eminence in any respect. Further the Hebrew word *Hakauton*, rendered *yonuger*, means *little, small*. The same word is used in Isaiah lx. 22. A LITTLE ONE shall become a thousand. Also in Isaiah xxii. 24. All vessels of SMALL quantity. So Psalms cxv. 13.—He will bless them that fear the Lord, both SMALL and great. Also Ex. xviii, 22. But every SMALL matter they shall judge. It would be a perfectly literal rendering of Gen. ix. 24, if it were translated thus, when Noah knew what his little son,* or grandson (*Hakauton beno*) had done unto him, He said cursed be Canaan, &c.

Further.—Even if it were a fact that the Africans are the descendants of Canaan, the assumption that the enslavement of the Africans by the Europeans and Americans is a fulfillment of the prophecy against Canaan, lacks even plausibility, for, only a mere *fractional minority* of the inhabitants of Africa have at any one time been the slaves of the Asiatics, Europeans and Americans. If the objector says in reply that a large majority of the inhabitants of Africa, are now slaves *at home*, and have been such for centuries, we answer, 1st. *It is false in point of fact*, though zealously bruited often to serve a turn.

2. *If it were true*, how does it help the argument? The prophecy was "Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be unto his BRETHREN" not unto himself!

OBJECTION II.—*If a man smite his servant or his maid with a rod and he die under his hand, he shall surely be punished. Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished, for he is his money.*—Exodus xxi. 20, 21.

* The French language in this respect follows the same analogy. Our word *grandson* being in French *petit fils*, (little son.)

Arguments drawn from the Jewish dispensation in support of slavery, originate in a misconception of the genius, not only of the Mosaic system *as a whole*, but of the design and scope of its most simple provisions.

The construction put by the advocates of slavery upon the verses quoted above, is an illustration in point.

What was the design of this regulation? Was it to grant masters an indulgence to beat servants with impunity? and an assurance that, if they beat them to death, the offence should not be *capital*? This is substantially what some modern Doctors tell us in their Commentaries and Bible Dictionaries. What Deity do such men worship? Some blood-gorged Moloch, enthroned on human hecatombs, breathing carnage and snuffing slaughter for incense? Did He who thundered from the midst of Sinai's flames and quakings, "THOU SHALT NOT KILL," offer in the same code a bounty on *murder*? Whoever analyzes the Mosaic system, in connection with the condition of the people for whom it was made—their inexperience in government—ignorance of judicial proceedings—laws of evidence, &c., will find a moot court, trying law points—settling definitions, and laying down rules of evidence, in almost every chapter.—Numbers xxxv. 10—22; Deuteronomy xi. 11, and xix. 4—6; Leviticus xxiv. 29—22; Exodus xxi. 18, 19, are a few out of many cases stated, with tests furnished to the judges, by which to detect motives, in actions brought before them. The detail gone into in the verses quoted, is manifestly to enable the judges to get at the *motive* of the action, and find out whether the master designed to kill.

1. "If a man smite his servant with a *rod*."—If the instrument used had not been mentioned, there would have been no clue by which to get at the motive; or if it had been an axe, or a bludgeon, the nature of the instrument would have revealed the motive.—See Numbers xxxv. 16, 18. But it was a *rod*, not a sword, nor a club, nor any other death-weapon,—hence, from the *kind* of instrument, no design *to kill* would be inferred; for if he had set upon him with *intent* to kill, he would hardly have taken a *rod* for his weapon. But if the servant dies *under his hand*, then the unfitness of the instrument for it, instead of being strong evidence in his favor, is point blank against him; for, to strike him with a *rod* until he *dies*, argues a *great*

many blows laid on with *great* violence, and this kept up to the very death-gasp, establishes the point of *intent to kill*. Hence the sentence, "He shall *surely* be punished." The case is plain and strong. If he had lived only a few minutes, or even a few hours after the infliction, evidence of intent to kill might still have warranted such a decision; but continuing *a day or two*, the *length of time that he lived*, together with the *kind* of instrument used, and the fact that the master had a pecuniary interest in his *life*, ("he is his *money*,") all together make out a strong case of circumstantial evidence, showing that the master did not *design* to kill; and requiring a corresponding decision and sentence. A single remark on the word "punished:—" "The Hebrew word here rendered punished, is *not rendered so in another instance in the Bible*. Yet, in our translation of the Old Testament, the word *punish* is employed *forty-four times*. Our translators have used that word generally to give the meaning of the Hebrew word *Paukad*. In *two* instances the word is *Aunash*.—Proverbs xxii. 3, and xxvii. 12, and in one *Hausak*.—Ezekiel ix. 13. But the word here translated punished is *Naukam*. It occurs thirty-five times in the Old Testament—in almost every instance it is translated *avenge*—in a very few, "*to take vengeance*," or "*to revenge*," and in this instance ALONE, "*punish*." As it stands in our translation, the pronoun preceding it refers to the *master*. It is the *master* in the 21st verse who is to be *punished*, and in the 22d *not* to be punished; whereas the preceding pronoun refers neither to the *master* nor to the *servant*, but to the *crime* and the word rendered *punished* should have been rendered *avenged*. The meaning is this: if a man smite his servant or his maid with a rod and he die under his hand, *IT* (the death) shall surely be avenged, or literally, *by avenging it shall be avenged*; that is, the *death* of the servant shall be *avenged* by the *death* of the master. So in the next verse—If he continue a day or two, his death shall not be avenged by the *death* of the *master*, as in that case the crime was to be adjudged *manslaughter*, and not *murder*, as in the first instance. In the following verse, another case of personal injury is stated, but not intentional, nor extending to life or limb, a mere accidental hurt, for which the injurer is to pay *a sum of money*; and yet our translators employ the

same phraseology in both cases. One, an instance of deliberate wanton, *killing by piecemeal with malice prepense*. The other an *accidental*, and comparatively slight injury—of the inflicter, in both cases, they say *the same thing!* *He shall surely be punished*. Now, just the difference which common sense and justice would expect to find in such cases where God legislates, is strongly marked in the original.

In the case of the servant willfully murdered, God says, "It (the death) shall surely be *avenged*," (naukam,) that is, *the life of the wrong doer shall expiate the crime*. The same word is used in the Old Testament when the greatest wrongs are redressed by devoting the perpetrators, whether individuals or communities, to *destruction*. In the case of the *unintentional* injury, in the following verse, God says, "He shall surely be" *fined*, (Aunash.) "He shall *pay* as the judges determine." The simple meaning of the word aunash is to lay a fine. It is used in Deuteronomy xxii. 19. "They shall *amerce* him in one hundred shekels," and in 2 Chronicles xxxvi. 3—"He condemned (*mulcted*) the land in a hundred talents of gold." This is the general use of the word and its primary signification. That *avenging* the death of the servant was neither imprisonment, nor stripes, nor amercing the master in damages, but that it was *taking the master's life* is shown,

1. By the *Bible usage* of the word Naukam.—See Genesis iv. 24; Joshua x. 13; Judges xv. 7—xvi. 28; 1 Samuel xiv. 24—xviii. 25—xxv. 31; 2 Samuel iv. 8; Judges v. 2; 1 Samuel xxv. 26—33. These and various other passages show the import of the word to be—a redressing of wrongs by inflicting *death* on the wrong doers.

2. This is further shown by the express statute in such case provided. Leviticus xxiv, 17.—*He that killeth ANY man* shall surely be put to death. Also Numbers xxxv. 30, 31.—*Whoso killeth ANY person* the murderer shall be put to death. *Moreover ye shall take NO SATISFACTION for the life of a murderer which is guilty of death, but he shall be surely put to death.*

3. The Targum of Jonathan gives the verse thus, "Death by the sword shall assuredly be adjudged." The Targum of Jerusalem thus, "Vengeance shall be taken for him to the *uttermost*." Jarchi gives the same rendering.

The Samaritan version thus expresses it, "He shall die the death." Again, the last clause in the 21st verse ("for he is his money") is often quoted to prove that the servant is his master's *property*, and *therefore*, if he died, the master was not *to be punished*. *Because*, 1st. A man may dispose of his *property* as he pleases. 2d. If the servant died of the injury inflicted, the master's *loss* was a sufficient punishment. A word about the premises before we notice the inferences. The assumption is, that the phrase "HE IS HIS MONEY" proves that the master has not only a pecuniary interest in the *services* of the servant, as among us, the masters of apprentices have in their labor, but that the *man*—the body, soul, and spirit is the actual bone fide *property* of his master. That the master's *title* to the body and mind of the servant is superior to the servant's title, and *extinguishes* it. Not only that the servant is *worth money* to the master, but that he is an *article of property* in such a sense that he has *no right to himself*. If the advocates of slavery insist upon taking this principle of interpretation into the Bible, and turning it loose, let them either give bonds for its good behaviour, or else stand and draw in self-defence, "lest it turn again and rend" them. If they indorse for the principle at one point, they must stand sponsors all around the circle. It will be too late to cry for quarter when they find that its stroke clears the whole table, and tilts them among the sweepings beneath. The Bible abounds with such expressions as the following:—"This (bread) is my body ; "this (wine) is my blood ;" "all they (the Israelites) are brass, and tin, and iron, and lead ;" "this is life eternal, that they might know thee ;" "this (the water of the well of Bethlehem) is the blood of the men who went in jeopardy of their lives ;" "I am the lily of the valleys ;" "a garden enclosed is my sister ;" "my tears have been my meat ;" "the Lord God is a sun and a shield ;" "God is love ;" "the Lord is my rock ;" "the seven good ears are seven years, and the seven good kine are seven years ;" "the seven thin and ill-favored kine are seven years, and the seven empty ears blasted by the east wind shall be seven years of famine ;" "he shall be head, and thou shalt be tail ;" "the Lord will be a wall of fire ;" "they shall be one flesh ;" "the tree of the field is man's life ;" "God is a consuming fire ;" "he is his money," &c.

Such a passion for the *exact literalities* of Bible language is so amiable, it were hard not to gratify it in this case. The words in the original are (Kasepo hu,) "his *silver* is he." The objector's principle of interpretation is, at least, a philosopher's stone, if not both a mine and a mint. Its miracle touch transmutes five feet eight inches of flesh and bones into *solid silver*. Quite a *permanent* servant, if not so nimble with all—reasoning against "*forever*" is forestalled henceforth, and Deut. xxiii. 15, utterly outwitted.

Who in his senses believes that in the expression, "*He is his money*," the object was to inculcate the doctrine that the servant was a *chattel*. The obvious meaning is, he is *worth money* to his master, and since if the master killed him it would take money out of his pocket, the *pecuniary loss*, the *kind of instrument used*, and the *fact of his living sometime after the injury*, (as, if the master meant to kill, he would be likely to *do* it while about it,) all together make out a strong case of presumptive evidence in the master's favor, clearing him of *intent to kill*. But let us look at the objector's inferences. One is, that the master might dispose of his *property* as he pleased, and therefore was not to be punished if he destroyed it. The absurdity of this is too plain to waste time about, for whether the servant died under the master's hand, or continued a day or two, he was *equally* his master's property, and the objector admits that in the *first* case the master is to be "*surely punished*" for destroying *his own property*!

The second inference is, that since the continuance of a day or two, cleared the master of *intent to kill*, the loss of the slave would be a sufficient punishment for inflicting the injury which caused his death. This inference makes the Mosaic law false to its own principles. A *pecuniary loss*, constituted no part of the claims of the law, where a person took the *life* of another. In such case the law utterly repudiated money, however large the sum. God would not so cheapen human life as to balance it with such a weight. "*Ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer, but he shall surely be put to death.*"—See Num. xxxv. 31.

Even in excusable homicide, a case of death purely accidental, as where an axe slipped from the helve and killed a

man, no sum of money availed to release from confinement in the city of refuge until the death of the High Priest.—Num. xxxv. 32. The inference that the loss of the servant would be a penalty *adequate* to the desert of the master, admits that he is *guilty*, that he deserves *some* punishment, and then it prescribes a *kind* of punishment utterly rejected by the law, in all cases where man took the life of man, either with or without *intent* to kill. In short, the objector annuls an integral part of the system,—repeals a vital law, resolves himself into a legislature, with power in the premises, makes a *new* law, coolly metes out such penalty as he thinks fit, both in kind and quantity, revises the Mosaic statutes, and gravely suggests vast betterments in Divine legislation! Further, the master who struck out the tooth of a servant, was required to set him free for his tooth's sake, no matter whether done intentionally or not. The *pecuniary loss* to the master was of course the same as though the servant had *died*. Let us look at the two cases. A master beats his servant so severely that after a day or two he dies of his wounds; another master accidentally strikes out the tooth of his servant, and he goes free—the *pecuniary loss of both masters is the same*. The objector contends that the loss of the slave's services in the first case is punishment sufficient for the crime of killing him, and *God* commands the *same* punishment to be inflicted even for the *accidental* knocking out of a *tooth*. Indeed unless the injury was done *inadvertently*, the loss of the servant's services is only a *part* of the punishment for thrusting out the tooth—that part which consists of reparation to the *individual* for injury done; the *main* punishment, that which was strictly *judicial*, was, adequate reparation to the *community* for the injury done it, by violence to one of its members. To set the servant *free*, and thus proclaim his injury, his right to redress, and the measure of it—did not answer the ends of public justice. The law must make an example of the offender, that “those that remain might hear and fear.”—See Lev. xxiv. 19, 20, 22. “*If a man cause a blemish in his neighbor, as he hath done so shall it be done unto him. Breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth; as he hath caused a blemish in a man, so shall it be done to him again. Ye shall have one manner of law as well for the stranger as for one of your own*

country." Thus putting all under the same criminal code. Finally, if a master smote out the tooth of a servant, the law smote out *his* tooth as a terror to other evil-doers; thus redressing the *public* wrong, and it cancelled the servant's obligation to the master, thus giving some compensation for the injury done, and exempting him from perilous liabilities in future.

OBJECTION III. *Both thy bondmen and bondmaids which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you, of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land, and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen forever.* Lev. xxv. 44—46.

The *points* in these verses, made by the objector, and urged as proof, not only that the Mosaic system permitted slavery, but sanctioned it, are 1. The word "BOND MEN." 2. "BUY." 3. INHERITANCE AND POSSESSION. 4. FOREVER.

The *second* point, the *buying* of servants has been already discussed, see page 254. And a part of the *third* (holding servants as a "possession." See p. 281.) We will now ascertain what sanction to slavery is derivable from the terms—"Bondmen," "Inheritance," and "Forever."

I. BOND MEN. The fact that servants procured from the Heathen were called in Scripture "*bondmen*," while those from the Israelites are called "*servants*," is deemed conclusive proof by many that the former were slaves. It is enough to say in reply, that the *caprices* of King James' translators were not divinely inspired. We need stand in no special awe of them. The word which they render *bondmen*, in this passage, is the *same* word which they uniformly render servants elsewhere. To show the absurdity of inferring that the Gentile servants were slaves, let us look at the use of the Hebrew word "*Ebed*" the plural of which is here translated "*bondmen*." "*Thy bondmen shall be of the Heathen of them shall ye buy bondmen,*" &c. In Isaiah xlii. 1. the *same word* is applied to Christ. "*Behold my servant* (bondman, slave?) whom I have chosen, mine elect in whom

my soul delighteth." So Isaiah lii. 13. "Behold my *servant*, (Christ) shall deal prudently." In 1 Kings xii. 6, 7. it is applied to *King Rehoboam*. "And they (the old men,) spake unto him saying if thou wilt be a *servant* (*Ebed*) unto this people this day, and wilt serve them, and answer them, and wilt speak good words to them, then they will be thy *servants* forever." In 2 Chron. xii. 7, 8, 9, 13. it is applied to the king and all the nation.

But waiving details, and text references, with which pages might be filled, suffice it to say that the word is applied to *all* persons who do service for others. It is applied to magistrates, to all governmental officers, to tributaries, to all the subjects of governments, to younger sons—defining their relation to the first born, who is called *Lord* and *ruler*—to Prophets, to Kings, to the Messiah, and in respectful addresses not less than *fifty* times in the Old Testament.

If as the advocates of slavery insist, the Israelites not only held slaves, but multitudes of them, it is no slight wonder that their language had *no word* that meant *slave*. If Abraham had *thousands* and if they *abounded* every where throughout the Mosaic system in such numbers that the eye saw them wherever it fell, why had they no such *word* as slave or slavery? That language must be piteously poverty stricken, which has *no signs* to represent those objects and conditions that are most *common* and *familiar*. To represent by the same word, and without figure, *property*, and the *owner* of that property, is a solecism in language; yet such cases abounded in the Bible, if "*Ebed*" means slave. Ziba was an "*Ebed*," yet he *owned* (!) twenty *Ebeds*. In *English*, besides the word *servant*, we have the word *slave*. Why? because we have the *thing*, and need a *sign* for it. If we had a sheath for the tongue, as a scabbard for the sword, we should have some *name* for it: but our dictionaries give us none. Why? because we have no such *thing*. But says the objector, would not the Israelites in speaking of the slaves in the surrounding nations use their word "*Ebed*?" Answer. Throughout the whole of the Old Testament, the servants of individuals among the Heathen are scarcely ever alluded to. *National* servants or *tributaries* are spoken of frequently; but so very rarely are their *domestic* servants alluded to, that no necessity existed, even if they were slaves,

for coining a new word. Besides the fact of their being domestics under *heathen laws and usages*, told the whole story as to their liabilities; their locality sufficiently designated the nature of the relation, so that in applying to them the word "*Ebed*," there was no danger of being misunderstood. But if as the objector insists there were not only *servants*, but besides these, a multitude of *slaves* held by the Israelites, a word meaning *slave*, would have been almost *indispensable* for purposes of every day convenience, and to prevent endless confusion. Further the laws of the Mosaic system were so many sentinels keeping watch on every side to warn off all foreign practices. The border ground of Canaan was quarantine ground, enforcing the strictest non-intercourse between the *without* and the *within*, not of *persons*, but of *usages*. The fact that the Hebrew language had no word corresponding to *slave*, or to *slavery*, though not a *conclusive* argument, is yet no slight corroborative.

II. "FOREVER."—"They shall be your bondmen *forever*." This is quoted to prove that the bondage of servants was *perpetual*. That they were to serve during their own life time, and their posterity from generation to generation.

No such idea is contained in the passage. The word *forever*, instead of defining the length of *individual* service, proclaims the *permanence* of the regulation laid down in the two verses preceding, namely, that their *permanent domestics* should be of the *strangers*, and not of the Israelites; and it specifies the duration of that general provision for domestic labor. As if God had said, you shall *always* get your *permanent* laborers from the nations round about you—your *servants* shall always be of *that* class of persons. As it stands in the original, it is perfectly plain,—"*Forever of them shall ye serve yourselves*." This is the literal rendering of the Hebrew words, which, in our translation, are rendered, "*They shall be your bondmen forever*."

This construction is entirely in keeping with the whole of the passage. "Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the *heathen* (the nations) that are round about you. OF THEM shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, OF THEM shall ye buy, &c." The design of this passage is manifest from its

very structure. It was to point out the *class* of persons from which they were to get their supply of servants, and the *way* in which they were to get them.

That "*forever*" refers to the relations of a *permanent* community, rather than to the services of *individuals*, which are always of uncertain tenure, and but for a brief period, at longest, is a fair inference from the form of the expression, "THEY shall be your possession. Ye shall take *them* as an inheritance for your children after you to inherit them for a possession." To say nothing of the uncertainty of *these individuals* surviving those *after* whom they are to live, the language used applies more naturally to a *body* of people, than to *individual* servants; and no other construction would ever have been put upon it, but for the influence of existing usages upon Scripture interpretation.

But suppose it otherwise; still *perpetual* service could not be argued from the term *forever*. The ninth and tenth verses of the same chapter limit it absolutely by the jubilee. "*Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the jubilee to sound on the tenth day of the seventh month: in the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet sound throughout ALL your land.*" "*And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto ALL the inhabitants thereof.*"

It may be objected that "inhabitants" here means only the *Israelitish* inhabitants. The command is, "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto "*ALL the inhabitants thereof.*" Besides, in the sixth verse, there is an enumeration of the different classes of the inhabitants, in which servants and strangers are included. "*And the Sabbath of the land shall be meet for you—[For whom? For you Israelites only?]*—*for thee, and for thy SERVANT, and for thy maid, and for thy hired servant, and for thy STRANGER that sojourneth with thee.*"

Further, throughout all the regulations about the jubilee, and the sabbatical year, the strangers in the land are manifestly included in the precepts, prohibitions, and promised blessings. Again; the year of jubilee was ushered in by the solemnities of the day of atonement.

What was the design of these institutions? The day of atonement prefigured the atonement of Christ, and the year of jubilee, the Gospel jubilee. And did they prefigure a

Messiah's atonement and a Gospel jubilee to *Jews* only? Were they types of the remission of sins, and of the proclamation of salvation, to the nation of *Israel* alone? Is there no redemption for us Gentiles in these ends of the earth, and is our hope presumption and impiety? Did that old partition wall survive the shock that made earth quake, and hid the sun, and burst the graves and rocks, and rent the temple vail? And did the Gospel only build it stronger and rear it higher to thunder direr perdition from its frowning battlements on all without? No! The God of our salvation lives. Good tidings of great joy shall be to ALL people. One shout shall swell from *all* the ransomed, "Thou hast redeemed us unto God by thy blood out of EVERY kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." To deny that the blessings of the jubilee, and of the atonement day extended to the servants from the *Gentiles* makes Christianity *Judaism*. It not only eclipses the glory of the Gospel, but strikes out the sun.

No denunciations in the Bible are more terrible than those pronounced by God upon such as would not release their servants at the sound of the jubilee trumpet. By refusing to do this, they falsified and disannulled a grand leading type of the atonement, and thus libelled the doctrine of Christ's redemption.

Finally, even if *forever* did refer to the length of *individual* service, we have ample precedents for limiting the term by the jubilee. The same word is used to define the length of time for which those *Jewish* servants were held, who refused to go out in the *seventh* year. And all admit that their term of service did not go beyond the jubilee.

The 23d verse of the same chapter is sometimes quoted to prove that the term *forever* reached beyond the jubilee, in the 46th verse. "*The land shall not be sold FOREVER, for the land is mine*"—as it would hardly be used in different senses in the same general connection. In reply, the objector is referred to the previous remarks on *forever*, showing that it respects the duration of the *general arrangement*, and not the term for which the *individual servants* and their posterity were to be held. Consequently, it is not at all affected by the jubilee; therefore the objection does not touch the argument, as it is. But it may not be amiss to show that it is equally harmless against any

other argument drawn from the use of forever in the 46th verse,—for the word there used, is *Olam*, meaning *throughout the period*, whatever that may be. Whereas in the 23d verse, it is *Zamud*, meaning *cutting off*, or *to be cut off*.

III. "INHERITANCE AND POSSESSION."—*Ye shall take them as an INHERITANCE for your children after you to inherit them for a possession.* This refers to the nations round about, and to the strangers sojourning among them, and not to the *individual* servants procured from these nations and strangers.

We have already settled the terms and tenure of this "inheritance and possession," and shown that they could not be held as a *property* possession, and inheritance; that they were in no sense *chattels*; that they could not hold them without their *consent*, nor without *paying* them an equivalent; that they were obliged by law to release them from their regular labor nearly *half the days in each year*, (or what on an average would be that,) and thoroughly to *instruct* them; that the servants were, equally with their masters, *protected* in all their personal, social, and religious rights, &c. Now, truly, all that remains after these abundant reservations, would be small temptation either to the lust of power or of lucre. What a harmless "possession" and "inheritance!" Suppose the same legal enactments were made in our slave states, and all the slaves immediately placed in precisely the same condition as the Jewish servants, what would become of those "*rights of property*" and "*chattels personal*?"

It is humiliating to witness the eagerness with which men snatch at a mere word, or even a bald technic, and without reference to connection, principles of construction, or laws of relation, Bible usage, or limitations of meaning by other passages, attach to it such a sense as accords with existing usages and sanctifies them,—and thus make the Bible a pander for their lusts. It matters little whether the meaning of the word be primary or secondary, literal or figurative, *provided* it sustains their practices.

But let us ascertain whether the words rendered "inherit" and "inheritance," when used in the Old Testament, necessarily point out the things inherited and possessed as *articles of property*, or, in any sense, as chattels.

1. *Nahal* and *Nahala*—*inherit* and *inheritance*. See

2 Chronicles x. 16.—“The people answered the king and said, what portion have we in David, and we have none *inheritance* in the son of Jesse.” Did they mean *gravely* to disclaim the right of holding their king as an article of *property*? Psalms cxxvii. 3.—“Lo, children are an *heritage* (inheritance) of the Lord.” Exodus xxxiv. 9.—“Pardon our iniquity and our sin, and take us for thine *inheritance*.” Are we to infer from this that when God pardons his enemies and adopts them as his children, that he makes them *articles of property*? Are forgiveness, and chattel-making, synonymes?

Psalms cxix. 111.—“Thy testimonies have I taken as a *heritage* (inheritance) forever.” Ezekiel xlv. 27, 28.—“And in the day that he goeth into the sanctuary, unto the inner court, to minister in the sanctuary, he shall offer his sin-offering saith the Lord God. And it shall be unto them for an *inheritance*; I am their *inheritance*.” Psalms ii. 8.—“Ask of me and I will give the heathen for thine *inheritance*.” Psalms xciv. 14.—“For the Lord will not cast of his people, neither will he forsake his inheritance.” See also Deuteronomy iv. 20; Joshua xiii. 33; Chronicles x. 16; Psalms lxxxii. 8, and lxxviii. 62, 71; Proverbs xiv. 8.

The question whether the servants were a PROPERTY—“*possession*,” has been already discussed—(See p. 281)—we need add in this place but a word. *Ahousa* rendered “*possession*.” Genesis xlii. 11.—“And Joseph placed his father and his brethren, and gave them a *possession* in the land of Egypt, in the best of the land, in the land of Rameses, as Pharaoh had commanded.”

In what sense was the land of Goshen the *possession* of the Israelites? Answer.—In the sense of *occupation*. They lived there as *tributaries* to the King of Egypt. Ezekiel xlv. 28.—“Ye shall give them no *possession* in Israel, I am their *possession*.” Now we put it to candor—in what sense were the Israelites to *possess* these nations and *take them* as an *inheritance for their children*? We answer.—They possessed them as a *permanent source of supply for domestic or household servants*. And this relation to these nations was to go down to posterity as a *standing regulation—a national usage respecting them, having the certainty and regularity of a descent by inheritance*. The sense of the whole regulation may be given thus: “Thy

permanent domestics, both male and female, which thou shalt have, shall be of the nations that are round about you, of *them* shall ye get male and female domestics."

"Moreover of the children of the foreigners that do sojourn among you, of *them* shall ye get, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land, and *they* shall be your permanent resource," (for household servants.) "And ye shall take them as a *perpetual* provision for your children after you, to hold as a *constant source of supply*. ALWAYS of *them* shall ye serve yourselves."

OBJECTION IV. *If thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee, thou shalt not compel him to serve as a BOND-SERVANT, but as an HIRED-SERVANT, and as a sojourner shall he be with thee, and shall serve thee unto the year of jubilee.*

As two classes of servants are mentioned, and as only those in one of the classes are called *hired* servants, the advocates of slavery tell us that those of the *other* class—the *bought* servants, were not *paid* for their labor. That is, that while God thundered anathemas against those who "used their neighbour's service *without wages*," he granted a special indulgence to his chosen people to seize persons, force them to labor, and rob them of earnings, provided always in selecting their victims they spared "the gentlemen of property and standing," and pounced only upon the *strangers* and the *common* people. From the fact that one class is technically called *hired*, and the other is *not* so called, the charitable inference is drawn that one class was *paid*, and the other *not* paid. This inference, like that from the word "*buy*," which we have already considered, is a mere assumption, not only that "*hired*" is synonymous with *paid*, but also that those servants not called "*hired*" were *not paid* for their labor, and that the *proof* of it is, the *fact that they are not so called*.

The meaning of the English verb *to hire*, is, as every one knows, to procure for a *temporary* use at a certain price—to engage a person to *temporary* service for wages. That is also the meaning of the Hebrew word "*Saukar*," as used in the Old Testament. Like the English word *hire*, the idea of *temporary* service, and generally for a *specific* object, is inseparable from its meaning. It is never

used when the procurement of *permanent* service for a long period is spoken of. Now we ask how could *permanent* servants have been designated?—those who were incorporated into the family for a course of years, and constituted an integral and stationary part of it? By the same term that marks *temporary* servants? The distinctions made in common parlance on this subject are as familiar as table-talk. In many families the domestics are employed only in such labor as every day brings along with it—the *regular* work. Whatever is *occasional* merely, as the washing of a family, is performed by persons *hired expressly for the purpose*. In such families nothing is more common in every day conversation than to hear this distinction between the two classes. The first are called “servants” or “domestics,” the other “hired help,” (not *paid* help.) *Both* classes are *paid*. One is permanent, the other occasional and temporary, and therefore in this case called “*hired*.” The folly of inferring that a servant is robbed of his earnings because when designated, the *technic* “hired” is not applied to him, is shown by the usages of all times and places. If I employ a man at twelve dollars a month to work my farm, he is my “*hired*” man, but if instead of giving him so much a month, *I give him such a portion of the crop*, or in other words, if he works my farm “*on shares*,” he is no longer my *hired* man. Every farmer knows that *that* designation is not applied to him. Yet he works the same farm, in the same way, at the same times, and with the same teams and tools; and does the same amount of work in the year, and perhaps clears twenty dollars a month instead of the twelve, paid him while he was my *hired* laborer. Now, as the *technic* “*hired*” is no longer used to designate him, and as he still labors on my farm, suppose my neighbors gather in conclave, and from such ample premises sagely infer, that since he is no longer my “*hired*” laborer I *rob* him of his earnings, and with all the gravity of owls, they record their decision, and adjourn to hoot it abroad. My neighbors are deep divers—like some theological professors, they not only go to the bottom, but come up covered with the tokens.

A variety of particulars are recorded in the Bible, distinguishing *hired* from *bought* servants. (1.) Hired servants

were paid daily at the close of their work.—Lev. xix. 13; Deut. xxiv. 14, 15; Job. vii. 2; Matt. xx. 8. "*Bought*" servants were paid in advance, (a reason for their being called bought,) and those that went out at the seventh year received a *gratuity* at the close of their period of service.—Deut. xv. 12—14. (2.) The hired servant was paid *in money*, the bought servant received his *gratuity*, at least in grain, cattle, and the product of the vintage.—Deut. xiv. 17. (3.) The *hired* servant *lived by himself* in his own family. The *bought* servant was a part of his master's family. (4.) The *hired* servant supported his family out of his wages; the *bought* servant and his family were supported by the master *besides* his wages.

A careful investigation of the condition, in all respects, of *hired* and of *purchased* servants, as described in the Bible, shows that *purchased servants were as a class superior to hired servants*—were held in more estimation, considered more trust-worthy, loved, honored, and rewarded more; had greater privileges, and occupied in every respect (*other things being equal*) a higher station in society. (1.) *They were intimately incorporated with the family of the master*, were guests at family festivals, and social solemnities from which hired servants were excluded.—Lev. xxii. 10; Exod. xii. 43, 45. (2.) *Their interests were far more identified with the general interests of their masters family*. This is shown by the fact that purchased servants were often actually or prospectively either sole or joint heirs of their master's estate. Witness the case of Eliezer, of Ziba, of the sons of Bilhah, and Zilpah, and others. It seems to have been a general usage where there were no sons to inherit the estate, or when by their unworthiness they had forfeited their title, to make the *purchased* servants heirs.—Prov. xvii. 2. We find traces of this usage in the New Testament. "But when the husbandmen saw him, they reasoned among themselves, saying, this is the *Heir*, come let us kill him, *that the inheritance may be ours*."—Luke xx. 14; also Mark xii. 7. But in no instance on Bible record does a *hired* servant inherit his master's estate, nor is there any allusion to such a possibility. (3.) *Marriages took place between purchased servants and their masters daughters*. "Now Sheshan had no sons but daughters: and Sheshan had a

servant, an Egyptian, whose name was Jarha. And She-shan gave his daughter to Jarha his servant to wife."—1 Chron. ii. 34, 35. There is no instance of a *hired* servant forming such an alliance.

(4.) *Purchased servants and their descendants seem throughout the Old Testament to be regarded by their masters' families, and by others with the same affection and respect as the other members of the family** The treatment of Eliezer, and the other servants in the family of Abraham, Gen. chap. 25—the intercourse between Gideon and his servant Phurah.—Judges vii. 10, 11. and Saul and his servant, in their interview with Samuel. 1 Sam. ix. 5, 22; and Jonathan and his servant, 1 Sam. xiv. 1—14. and Elisha and his servant Gehazi, are illustrations.

On the other hand there are no allusions to *hired* servants indicating *any enduring tie* between them and their masters. But on the other hand, there are allusions to their want of fidelity, and the slight trust reposed in them, John x. 12, 13.

Hired servants seem to have been taken from the lowest and most ignorant of the people, this would naturally be inferred from a comparison of their *employments*, with those of purchased servants. No instance occurs in which they are assigned to business, demanding education or skill. Various passages show the low repute and trifling character of the class from which they were hired.—Judges ix. 4. 1 Sam. ii. 5.

The superior condition and privileges of purchased servants, their more honourable estimation, and the greater affection with which they were regarded, are manifested in the important and honourable trusts confided to them, and in the dignity and authority with which they were clothed in their master's household. But in no instance is a *hired* servant thus distinguished. In some cases the *bought* servant is manifestly the master's representative in the family. His vicegerent with plenipotentiary powers over adult children, even negotiating marriage for them. Abraham

* The following is Maimonides' testimony to the condition of the purchased servant. "For the *purchased servant* who is an Israelite, or proselyte, shall fare as his master. The master shall not eat fine bread, and his servant bread of bran. Nor yet drink old wine, and give his servant new; nor sleep on soft pillows, and bedding, and his servant on straw. I say unto you that he that gets a *purchased* servant does well to make him as his friend, or he will prove to his employer as if he got himself a master."—Maimonides, in Mishna Kiddushim. Chap. 1st. Sec. 2.

besought Eliezer his servant to take a solemn oath, that HE would not take a wife for Isaac of the daughters of the Canaanites—but that he would take a wife for him from Abraham's kindred. The servant went accordingly, and *himself* selected the individual. Servants also exercised discretionary power in the management of the estate, "And the servant took ten camels, of the camels of his master, for all the goods of his master were under his hand."—Gen. xxiv. 10. The reason assigned for taking them is not that such was Abraham's direction, but that the servant had discretionary control. They had also discretionary power in the *disposal of property*.—Gen. xxiv. 22, 23, 53, besides being conservators of the respectability of the family, and fully empowered to devise and execute whatever would promote its interests, or was befitting to its honor.—See Gen. xxiv. chapter, generally.

The condition of Ziba in the house of Mephibosheth, is a case in point. So is Prov. xvii. 2. Distinct traces of this estimation are to be found in the New Testament, Math. xxiv. 45. Luke xii. 42, 44. So in the parable of the talents; the master seems to have set up each of his servants in trade with considerable capital. One of them could not have had less than eight thousand dollars. The parable of the unjust steward is another illustration. Luke xvi. 4, 8. He evidently was intrusted with large *discretionary* power, was "accused of wasting his master's goods," and manifestly regulated with his master's debtors, the *terms* of settlement. Such trusts were never reposed in *hired* servants.

The inferior condition of *hired* servants, and a striking proof that they were the *lowest class of servants* is furnished in the parable of the prodigal son. When the prodigal, perishing with hunger among the swine and husks came to himself; his proud heart broke, "I will arise," he cried, "and go to my father." And then to assure his father of the depth of his humility, resolved to add imploringly "make me as one of thy *hired* servants." It need not be remarked that if *hired* servants were the *superior* class; to apply for the situation, and press the suit, while it argued a keen relish for personal comforts, and no small pains to get them, savored little of that sense of unworthiness that seeks the dust with hidden face and cries "unclean." Unhumbled nature *climbs*; or if it falls, clings fast, where first it may.

Humility sinks of its own weight, and in the lowest deep, digs lower. The design of the parable was to illustrate on the one hand, the delight of God as he beholds a far off the approach of the sinner "seeking an injured father's face," and runs to embrace and bless him with an unchiding welcome; and on the other, the contrition of the penitent returning with tears from his wanderings, his stricken spirit deep-humbled and breaking with its ill-desert—bowing like a bull-rush he dares not lift his eyes, but smites upon his breast, and sobs aloud "the lowest place, *the lowest place*, I can abide no other." Or in those inimitable words, "*Father I have sinned against Heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy Son, make me as one of thy HIRED servants.*" The supposition that *hired* servants were the *highest* class, takes from the parable an element of winning beauty and pathos. It is manifest to every careful student of the Bible, that *one* class of servants, was in the family on terms of equality with the children and other members of it. (Hence the force of Paul's declaration, Gall. iv. 1. "*Now I say unto you that the heir as long as he is a child DIFFERETH NOTHING FROM A SERVANT though he be lord of all.*") If this were the *hired* class, the prodigal was a sorry specimen of humility. Would our Lord have put such language into the lips of one held up by himself as a model of gospel humility, to illustrate its lowliness, its conscious destitution of all merit, and deep conviction of all ill desert? If this is *humility*, put it on stilts, and set it a strutting, while pride takes lessons and blunders in apeing it.

Here let it be observed that both Israelites and Strangers, belonged indiscriminately to *each* class of the servants, the *bought* and the *hired*. That those in the former class, whether Jews or Strangers, were in higher estimation and rose to honors and authority in the family circle which were not conferred on *hired* servants, has been already shown. It should be added, however, that in the enjoyment of privileges, merely *political and national*, the hired servants from the *Israelites* were far more favored than either the hired or the bought servants from the *Strangers*. No one from the Strangers, however wealthy or highly endowed, was eligible to the highest office, nor could he own the soil. This last disability, to which all Strangers were subject, seems to have been one reason for the different periods of servi-

tude required of the two classes of bought servants—the Israelites and the Strangers. The Israelite was to serve six years—the Stranger until the jubilee.*

As the Strangers could not own the soil, they had few inducements to engage in agriculture; and as they could possess houses of their own only within walled towns, and the Mosaic system offered small encouragement to mechanical trades, the great bulk of them, would be under strong inducements to attach themselves permanently to Israelitish families. Those Strangers who were wealthy or skilled in manufactures, encouraged by the Jewish polity, instead of becoming servants themselves, would have occasion to buy servants for their own use, and as the inducements for the Strangers to become servants, to the Israelites, were for obvious reasons, greater than individuals of their own nation could hold out to them, these wealthy Strangers would naturally procure the *poorer* Israelites for servants.—See Leviticus xxv. 47. In a word, such was the political condition of the Strangers under the Mosaic system, and such the construction of the Jewish polity, as to furnish a strong motive to them, to become servants, and as much as possible incorporate themselves with the Jewish nation, and by so doing procure those social and religious privileges already enumerated, and for their children in the second generation a permanent inheritance. (This last regulation was not made until a late period in the nation's history.—Ezekiel xlvi. 21—23.) Indeed, the structure of the whole Mosaic polity, was a virtual bounty offered to those who would become permanent servants, and merge in the Jewish system their distinct nationality. None but the monied aristocracy among them would be likely to decline such offers.

For various reasons this class, (the servants bought from the Strangers,) would prefer a service for a long course of years. They would, then, more effectually become absorbed into the national circulation and identify their interests with those in whose gift were all things desirable for themselves and brighter prospects for their children. On the other hand, the Israelites, owning all the soil, and great sacredness being attached to an inheritance of land, to hold

* Both classes may with propriety be called *permanent* servants; even the bought Israelite, when his six-years' service is contrasted with the brief term of the hired servant.

it free of encumbrance, was, with every Israelite, a most delicate point of family honor and pride, as well as personal character.—1 Kings xxi. 3. Hence, being obliged to forego the *possession* of one's inheritance for a long course of years, *after* the division of the paternal domain, was to an Israelite well nigh intolerable; and, after having *acceded* to it, to be restrained from its *control* even for a short time, was a great affliction. To mitigate as much as possible such a calamity, the law, instead of requiring him to continue a servant until the jubilee, releases him at the end of six years,* as, perchance, during that time—if, of the first class—the partition of the patrimonial land may have taken place; and, if of the second, enough money may have been earned to disencumber his estate, and thus enable him to take his station as an independent lord of the soil. If those contingencies had not yet occurred, then, at the end of another six years, the opportunity was again offered, and in the same manner until the jubilee. So while strong motives urged the Israelite to discontinue his service as soon as the exigency had passed, which induced him to become a servant, every consideration impelled the Stranger to *prolong* his term of service; and the same kindness which dictated the law of six years' service for the Israelite, who owned a landed estate, partook of the political privileges, and was eligible to the honors of the Jewish polity, assigned as the general rule, a much longer period to the Gentile servant, who, instead of being tempted to a *brief* service, had every inducement to *protract* the term.

It is important to a clear understanding of the whole subject for the reader to keep in mind that adult Jews ordinarily became servants, only as 'a temporary expedient to relieve themselves from embarrassment, and ceased to be such when that object was effected. The poverty which forced them to it was a calamity, and their service, was merely the

* Another reason for protracting the service until the seventh year seems to have been, its coincidence with other arrangements, and provisions, inseparable from the Jewish economy. That period was a favorite one in the Mosaic system. Its pecuniary responsibilities, social relations, and general internal structure, if not graduated upon a septennial scale, were variously modified by the lapse of that period. Another reason doubtless was, that as those Israelites who became servants through poverty, would not sell themselves, except as a last resort, when other expedients to recruit their finances had failed—(See Lev. xxv. 35.)—their *becoming servants* proclaimed such a state of their affairs as demanded the labour of a *course of years* fully to reinstate them.

means of relief, or a measure of prevention. Of course it was not pursued as a *permanent business*, but resorted to on emergencies, a sort of episode in the main scope of their lives. Whereas with the Gentiles, it was a *permanent employment*, pursued not merely as a *means* of bettering their own condition, and prospectively that of their posterity, but also, as an *end* for its own sake, conferring on them privileges, and a social estimation not otherwise attainable.

We see from the foregoing why *Gentile* purchased servants are called by way of distinction *the* servants, (not *bondmen* as our translators have it.) (1.) They followed it as a *permanent business*. It was their profession. (2.) Their term of service was *much longer* than that of the other class. (3.) As a class, they doubtless greatly out-numbered the Israelitish servants. (4.) All the Strangers that dwelt in the land, whatever their wealth or station, were *tributaries* to the Israelites—required to pay an annual tribute to the government either in money, or in some public service, which was called a "*tribute of bond service*;" in other words all the strangers were *national servants* to the Israelites, and the same Hebrew word which is used to designate *individual* servants, equally designates *tributaries* or *national* servants.—2 Sam. viii. 2, 6, 14. 2 Chron. viii. 7—9. Deut. xx. 11. 2 Sam. x. 19. 1 Kings ix. 21, 22. 1 Kings iv. 21. Gen. xxvii. 29. The same word is also applied to the Israelites when they paid tribute to other nations, (See 2 Kings xvii. 3. Judges iii. 8, 14. Gen. xlix. 15. Another distinction between the Jewish and Gentile bought servants, claims special notice. It was in the *kinds* of service assigned to each class. The servants from the strangers were properly the *domestics*, or household servants, employed in all family work, in offices of personal attendance, and in such mechanical work as was constantly required in every family by increasing wants, and needed repairs. On the other hand the Jewish bought servant seems to have been almost exclusively *agricultural*. Besides being better fitted for this by previous habits—agriculture, and the tending of cattle, were regarded by the Israelites as the most honourable of all occupations; kings engaged in them. After Saul was elected king, received by the people with shouting, and escorted to Gibeah, the next report of him is "*And behold Saul came after the herd out of the field.*"—1 Sam. xi. 7.

Elisha "was plowing with twelve yoke of oxen" when the Prophet Elijah threw his mantle upon him.—1 Kings xix. 19. So King Uzziah "loved husbandry."—2 Chron. xxvi. 10. Gideon, the deliverer of Israel *was* "*threshing wheat* by the wine press" when the angel called him to lead the host against the Midianites.—Judges vi. 11. The superior honorableness of agriculture is shown by the fact that it was *protected and supported by the fundamental law* of the theocracy—God thus indicating it as the chief prop of the government, and putting upon it peculiar honor. An inheritance of land seems to have *filled out* an Israelite's idea of worldly furnishment. They seemed almost like permanent fixtures on their soil, so did they cling to it. To be agriculturalists on their own inheritances, was, in their notions, the only solid foundation of family consequence, and the grand claim to honorable estimation. Agriculture being pre-eminently *Jewish* as an employment, to assign a native Israelite to *other* employments as *a business* was to break up his habits, do violence to cherished predilections, put him to a kind of labor in which he had no skill, and which he deemed degrading. In short, it was in the earlier ages of the Mosaic system practically to *unjew* him, a hardship and rigor grievous to be borne, as it annihilated a visible distinction between the descendants of Abraham and the Gentiles, a distinction vital to the system, and gloried in by every Jew.

To guard this and another fundamental distinction, God instituted the regulation contained in Leviticus xxv. 39, which stands at the head of this branch of our inquiry, "*If thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee, thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond-servant.*" In other words, thou shalt not put him to *servants work*—to the *business*, and into the *condition of domestics*.

In the Persian version of the Old Testament it is translated thus, "Thou shalt not assign to him the work of *servitude*," (or *menial labor*.) In the Septuagint thus, "He shall not serve thee with the service of a *domestic or household servant*." In the Syriac version thus, "Thou shalt not employ him after the manner of servants." In the Samaritan version thus, "Thou shalt not require him to serve in the service of a servant." In the Targum of

Onkelos thus, "He shall not serve thee with the service of a household servant." In the Targum of Jonathan thus, "Thou shalt not cause him to serve according to the usages of the servitude of servants.* In fine, "thou shalt not compel him to serve as a servant," means this beyond question, *thou shalt not assign him to the same grade, nor put him to the same services with permanent domestics.*

We will now notice the remainder of the regulation contained in the 40th verse, viz. :—

"But as an hired servant and as a sojourner shall he be with thee." How as a hired servant and a sojourner? Answer. The "hired servants were not incorporated into the families of their masters; they still retained their own independent family organization, and their former station in their own social circle, without surrendering any domestic privileges, honor, or authority which they might have previously possessed. Their family organization seems to have remained distinct, even though they resided under the same roof with their master. This is shown in the fact, that while bought-servants were associated with their master's families at meals, and at the Passover, and at other family festivals, the hired servants and sojourners were not.—Exod. xii. 44, 45; Lev. xxii. 10, 11. Not being merged in the family of his master, the hired servant was not under his authority, except in receiving directions from him about his labor. Hence the only form of oppressing hired servants spoken of in the Scriptures as practicable to masters, is that *of keeping back their wages.* The hired servant was not subject to the master in any such sense as the master's wife, children, and bought servants. The same remark applies to the condition of *sojourners.*

To have deprived the individual of these privileges in the particular instance stated in the passage, would have been preeminent *rigor*; for the case described, is not that of a servant born in the house of a master, nor that of a minor, whose unexpired minority had been sold by the

* Jarchi's comment on "Thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond-servant" is, "A Hebrew servant is not to be required to do any thing which is accounted degrading—such as all offices of personal attendance, as loosing his master's shoe latchet, bringing him water to wash his feet and hands, waiting on him at table, dressing him, carrying things to and from the bath. The Hebrew servant is to work with his master as a son or brother, in the business of his farm, or other labor, until his legal release."

father, neither was it the case of an Israelite, who though of age, had not yet acceded to his inheritance; nor, finally, was it that of one who had received the assignment of his inheritance, but was as a servant, working off from it an incumbrance, before entering upon its possession and control.* But it was that of *the head of a family* who had lived independently on his own inheritance, as lord of the soil, and long known better days, now reduced to poverty, forced to relinquish the loved inheritance of his fathers, with the competence and respectful consideration its possession secured to him, and to be indebted to a neighbor for shelter, sustenance, and employment, both for himself and his family. Surely so sad a reverse might well claim sympathy; but there remaineth to him one consolation, "a joy with which the *Stranger* intermeddleth not,"—and it cheers him in the house of his pilgrimage. He is an *Israelite*—*Abraham is his father*, and now in his calamity he clings closer than ever to the distinction conferred by the immunities of his birth-right. To rob him of this, were "the unkindest cut of all." To have assigned him to a *grade* of service filled only by those whose permanent business was *serving*, (such as domestic labor, in-door jobs, and those offices of personal attendance, performed only by servants from the Strangers,) would have been to *rule over him with peculiar rigor*.

Finally, the former part of the regulation, "Thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond-servant," or more literally, *thou shalt not serve thyself with him with the service of a servant*, guarantees his political privileges and national birth-right, and secures to him a kind and grade of service, comporting with his character and relations as a son of Israel. And the remainder of the verse, "But as a *hired* servant, and as a sojourner shall he be with thee," continues and secures to him the blessings of a separate family organization, the respect and authority due to its head, and the general consideration in society resulting from such a station. Though this individual was a Jewish *bought* servant, the case is peculiar, and forms an exception to the general class of Jewish bought servants, from which it should be carefully distinguished. Being already in possession of his

* These two latter classes are evidently referred to in Exod. xxi. 1—6, and Deut. xv. 12.

inheritance, and the head of a household, the law so arranged his relations, as a servant, as to *alleviate* as much as possible the calamity which had reduced him from independence and authority, to penury and subjection.

Having gone so much into detail on this point, comment on the command which concludes this topic in the forty-third verse would be superfluous. "*Thou shalt not rule over him with rigor, but shalt fear thy God.*" As if it had been said, "In your administration you shall not disregard those differences in previous habits, station, authority, and national and political privileges, upon which this regulation is based; for to exercise authority over this class of servants, *irrespective* of these distinctions, and annihilating them, is to *rule with rigor.*" The same command is repeated in the forty-sixth verse, and applied to the distinction between the servants of Jewish, and those of Gentile extraction, and forbids the overlooking of distinctive Jewish peculiarities, which were invested with such interest to an Israelite as to make the violation of them *rigorous* in the extreme; while to the servant from the Strangers, whose previous habits and associations differed so widely from those of the Israelite, these same things so far from being objects of desire, would in many instances have proved a burden, and been objects of aversion.

It may be remarked here, that the political and other disabilities of the Strangers, which were the distinctions growing out of a different national descent, and important to the preservation of national characteristics, and to the purity of national worship, do not seem to have effected at all the *social* estimation in which this class of servants was held. They were regarded with an affectionate and respectful consideration according to their character and worth as *persons*, entirely irrespective of their foreign origin, employments, and political condition.

A construction is sometimes put upon the expression, "*rule with rigor,*" and an inference drawn from it with an air so ghostly oracular, as would be quite an over charge for risibles of any ordinary calibre, if such an effect were not forestalled by its impiety. It is interpreted to mean, you shall not make him an article of property, you shall not force him to work, and rob him of his earnings you shall not make him a "chattel," and strip him of legal protection. So much for the interpretation. The inference is like unto it, viz.—Since the

command forbade such outrages upon the *Israelites*, it *permitted and commissioned* the infliction of them upon the *Strangers*. Such impious and shallow smattering, captivates two classes of minds, the one by its pert flippancy, the other by its blasphemy, and both by the strong scent of its unbridled license. What boots it to reason against such rampant affinities!

In Exodus, Chap. i. 13, 14. It is said that the Egyptians "made the children of Israel to *serve with rigor*," "and all their *service* wherein they made them *serve*, was with rigor." That is, the Egyptians forced them to work beyond their strength, and afflicted them with oppressive burdens. The rigor here spoken of, is affirmed of the *amount or degree* of labour extorted from them, and the *mode* of the exaction. This form of expression, "*serve with rigor*," is never used respecting the service of the servants under either the Patriarchal, or the Mosaic systems. Nor is any other form of expression ever used, either equivalent to it, or at all similar. The phrase "thou shalt not *rule* over him with rigor," used in Leviticus xxv. 43, 46, does not prohibit unreasonable exactions of labor, nor inflictions of personal cruelty. *Such were abundantly provided against otherwise*. But it forbids confounding the distinctions between a Jew and a Stranger, by assigning the former to the same grade of service, for the same term of time, and under the same national and political disabilities as the latter.

We are now prepared to survey at a glance the general condition of the different classes of servants, with the modifications peculiar to each class. I. In the possession of *all fundamental rights*, all classes of servants were on an *absolute equality*, all were *equally protected* by law in their persons, character, property and social relations. All were *voluntary*, all were *compensated* for their labour. All were released from their regular labour for an amount of time nearly equal to *one half of the days in each year*, all were furnished with stated and abundant *instruction*; none in either class were in any sense articles of *property* or chattels personal or real, all were regarded as *men* with the rights, capacities, interests, hopes, objects and destinies of *men*. In these respects the circumstances of *all* classes of servants among the Israelites, were not only similar but *identical*, and so far forth, they formed but *ONE CLASS*.

II. DIFFERENT CLASSES OF SERVANTS.

1. *Hired servants*.—This class was composed both of Israelites and Strangers. The employments in which they worked for hire, were generally different. The *Israelite* was an agricultural servant, because fitted for it by previous habits, taste, and national predilections. The Stranger was a *domestic* and *personal* servant, and in some instances *mechanical*; both were *occasional*, procured *temporarily* to serve an emergency. Whether Israelites or Strangers they lived in their own families. Their wages were *money*, and they were paid when their work was done. As a *class of servants* the hired were less loved, trusted, honoured and promoted than any other.

2. *Bought servants, (including homeborn)*.—This class also, was composed of both Israelites and Strangers, the same general difference obtaining in their kinds of employment as was noticed before. The *Israelite* working on the farm, and the *Stranger* at household work, jobbing and personal attendance. Both were paid in advance,* and neither were temporary.

The Israelitish servant, in most instances, was released after six years. (The *freeholder* continued until the jubilee.) The Stranger was, in all cases, a *permanent* servant, continuing until the jubilee. Besides these distinctions between Jewish and Gentile bought servants, a marked distinction obtained between different classes of Jewish bought servants. Ordinarily, the Jewish bought servant, like the Gentile, was, during his term of service, merged in his master's family as an integral part of it, and, like the wife and children of the master, subject to his authority; (and of course, like them, protected by law from its abuse.) But one class of the Jewish bought servants was a marked exception. The *freeholder*, obliged by poverty to leave his

* The payment *in advance*, doubtless lessened considerably the price of the purchase; the servant thus having the use of the money from the beginning, and the master assuming all the risks of life, and health for labour,—at the expiration of the six years contract, the master having experienced no loss from the risk incurred at the making of it, was obliged by law to release the servant with a liberal gratuity. The reason assigned for this is "he hath been worth a double hired servant unto thee in serving thee six years," as if it had been said; he has now served out his time, and as you have experienced no loss from the risks of life, and ability to labour which you incurred in the purchase, and which lessened the price, and as, by being your permanent servant six years, he has saved you all the time and trouble of looking up and hiring labourers on emergencies, therefore "thou shalt furnish him liberally," &c.

possession, and sell himself as a servant, did not thereby affect his family relations, or authority, nor subject himself as an inferior to the control of his master, though dependant upon him for employment. In this respect, his condition differed from that of the main body of Jewish bought servants, which seems to have consisted of those who had not yet come into possession of their inheritance, or of those who were dislodging from it an incumbrance.

Having dwelt so much at length on this part of the subject, the reader's patience may well be spared farther details. We close it with a suggestion or two which may serve as a solvent of some minor difficulties, if such remain.

I. It should be kept in mind that *both* classes of servants, the Israelite and the Gentile, not only enjoyed *equal natural and religious rights*, but each enjoyed *all the civil and political privileges which belonged to their NATIONAL class*. If Israelites, all the immunities within the Jewish pale were theirs. If descended from the Strangers, the same civil and political privileges enjoyed by those wealthy Strangers, who, instead of being servants themselves, bought and held *Israelitish* servants, *were theirs*. So they shared *in common with them*, the political disabilities which appertained to all Strangers, whether they were the servants of Jewish masters, or the masters of Jewish servants.

II. The disabilities of the servants from the Strangers were exclusively *political* and *national*.

1. They, in common with all Strangers, *could not own the soil*.

2. They were *ineligible to civil offices*.

3. They were assigned to *employments* less honorable than those in which Israelitish servants engaged; agriculture being regarded as fundamental to the prosperity and even to the existence of the state, other employments were in far less repute and deemed *unjewish*.

Finally, the condition of the strangers, whether servants or masters, was as it respected political privileges, much like that of unnaturalized foreigners in the United States; no matter how great their wealth or intelligence, or moral principle, or love for our institutions, they are obliged to perform a long quarantine about the ballot-box—are ineligible to office, and in many of the states are prohibited the ownership of the soil. Let a native American, who has

always enjoyed these privileges, be suddenly bereft of them by the government, and loaded with the political disabilities of an alien, and what to the foreigner would hardly be matter of consciousness, would be to *him* the severity of *rigor*.

The recent condition of the Jews and Catholics in England, illustrates still more fully the political condition of the strangers in Israel. Rothschild, the late English banker, though the richest man in the world, and perhaps the master of scores of English servants, who sued submissively for the smallest crumbs of his favor, was as a citizen, a subject of the government, immeasurably inferior to the veriest scavenger among them. Suppose a native Englishman of the Established Church were by law deprived of power to own the soil, made ineligible to office, and deprived unconditionally of the electoral franchise, would Englishmen think it a misapplication of language if it were said, "the government rules over that man "with rigor?" And yet his life, limbs, property, reputation, conscience, all his social relations, the disposal of his time, the right of locomotion at pleasure, and of natural liberty in all respects, are just as much protected by law as the Lord Chancellor's. The same was true of all "the strangers within the gates" among the Israelites. Whether these strangers were the servants of Israelitish masters, or the masters of Israelitish servants, whether sojourners, or bought servants, or born in the house, or hired, or neither—all *were protected equally with the descendants of Abraham*.

FINALLY.—As the Mosaic system was a great compound type, made up of innumerable fractional ones, each rife with meaning in doctrine and duty; the practical power of the whole, depended upon the exact observance of those distinctions and relations which constituted its significancy. Hence the care everywhere shown to preserve inviolate the distinction between a *descendant of Abraham* and a *Stranger*, even when the stranger was a proselyte, had gone through the initiatory ordinances, entered the congregation, and become incorporated with the Israelites by family alliance. The regulation laid down in Exodus xxi. 2—6, is an illustration, "*If thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve: and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing. If he came in by himself, he*

shall go out by himself: if he were married, then his wife shall go out with him. If his master have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons or daughters; the wife and her children shall be her master's, and he shall go out by himself. And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children, I will not go out free: then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door-post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl, and he shall serve him for ever." In this case the Israelitish servant, whose term expired in six years, married one of his master's *permanent female domestics*: but the fact of her marriage did not release her master from *his* part of the contract for her whole term of service, nor absolve him from his legal obligation to support and educate her children. Nor could it do away that distinction which marked her national descent by a specific *grade* and *term* of service. Her marriage did not impair her obligation to fulfil *her* part of the contract. Her relations as a permanent domestic grew out of a distinction made prominent by God, and guarded with great care throughout the Mosaic system. To permit this to be rendered void would have been dividing the system against itself. This God would not tolerate. Nor, on the other hand, would he permit the master to throw off the responsibility of instructing her children, nor the burden and expense of their helpless infancy and rearing. He was bound to support and educate them, and all her children born afterward during her term of service. The whole arrangement beautifully illustrates that wise and tender regard for the interests of all the parties concerned, which arrays the Mosaic system in robes of glory, and causes it to shine as the sun in the kingdom of our Father. By this law the children had secured to them a mother's tender care. If the husband loved his wife and children he could compel his master to keep him, whether he had any occasion for his services or not, and with such remuneration as was provided by the statute. If he did not love them, to be rid of him was a blessing; and in that case the regulation would prove an act for the relief of an afflicted family. It is not by any means to be inferred that the release of the servant from his service in the seventh year, either absolved him from the

obligations of marriage, or shut him out from the society of his family. He could doubtless procure a service at no great distance from them, and might often be induced to do it by the offer of higher wages, or of a kind of employment better suited to his taste or skill, or because his master might not have sufficient work to occupy him. The fact of his living near his family, or even if at a considerable distance, the great number of days on which the law released servants from regular labor, would enable him to spend much more time with them than can be spent by most of the agents of our benevolent societies with *their* families, or by many merchants, editors, artists, &c., whose daily business is in New-York or Philadelphia, while their families reside from ten to one hundred miles in the country.

Perhaps it will be said that a point vital to the whole question has been overlooked in all the preceding arguments and answers to objections, namely,—

OBJECTION V.—THE SLAVERY OF THE CANAANITES BY THE ISRAELITES, WAS APPOINTED BY GOD AS A COMMUTATION OF THE PUNISHMENT OF DEATH DENOUNCED AGAINST THEM FOR THEIR SINS.—If the absurdity of a sentence consigning persons to *death*, and at the same time to perpetual *slavery*, did not sufficiently laugh in its own face, it would be small self-denial, in a case so tempting, to make up the deficiency by foreign contribution. For, *be it remembered*, the Mosaic law on this as on all other points, was given, while Israel *was in the wilderness*, and only *one* statute was ever given respecting *the disposition to be made of the inhabitants of the land*. If the sentence of death was first pronounced against them, and afterwards *commuted*, when? where? by whom? and in what terms was the commutation? And where is it recorded? We need *light* on these points, and are content patiently to wait for it. Grant, for argument's sake, that all the Canaanites were sentenced to unconditional extermination; as there was no reversal of the sentence, how can a right to *enslave* them, be drawn from such premises? The punishment of death is one of the highest recognitions of man's moral nature possible. It proclaims him *man*—intelligent, accountable, guilty *man*, deserving death for having done his utmost to cheapen human life, and make it worthless, when the proof of its price-

less value, lives in his own nature, and is a part of it. But to make him a *slave*, cheapens to nothing *universal human nature*, and instead of healing a wound, gives a death stab. What! repair an injury done to rational being in the robbery of *one* of its rights, not merely by robbing it of *all*, but by annihilating the very *foundation* of them—that everlasting distinction between men and things? To make a man a chattel is not the *punishment*, but the *annihilation* of a *human* being, and so far as it goes of *all* human beings. This commutation of the punishment of death, denounced against the Canaanites, into perpetual slavery, what a fortunate discovery! What would have become of the honor of Deity, if by a well-timed movement, the commentators had not manned the forlorn hope, and, at the very crisis of its fate, rushed to the rescue of the Divine character, and covered its retreat from the perilous position in which inspiration had carelessly left it! Here a question arises of sufficient importance for a separate dissertation; but must for the present be disposed of in a few paragraphs. Perhaps on another occasion it may be discussed at length. WERE THE CANAANITES SENTENCED BY GOD TO INDIVIDUAL AND UNCONDITIONAL EXTERMINATION? That the views commonly prevalent on this subject, even among the enemies, as well as the advocates of slavery are radically wrong, we verily believe; but as the limits of this inquiry forbid our going fully into the merits of the question so as to give all the grounds of dissent from the commonly received opinions, the few remarks made, will be thrown out rather as *QUERIES*, than as a formal laying down of *doctrines*.

The leading commands for the destruction of the Canaanites are mainly in the following passages, Exod. xxiii. 23—33, and 33—51, and 34, 11. Deut. vii. 16—25, and ix. 3, and xxxi. 3, 1, 2. In these verses the Israelites are commanded to “destroy the Canaanites”—to “drive out”—“consume”—“utterly overthrow”—“put out”—“dispossess them” &c. Quest. Did these commands enjoin the unconditional, and universal destruction of the *individuals*, or merely of the *body politic*? Ans. The Hebrew word *Hauroum*, to destroy, signifies *national* as well as individual destruction; *political* existence, equally with *personal*; the destruction of governmental organization, equally with the lives of the subjects. Besides if we interpret the words destroy, con-

sume, overthrow, &c., to mean *personal* destruction, what meaning shall we give to the expressions, "drive out before thee;" "cast out before thee;" expel," "put out," "dispossess," &c. which are used in the same passages?

For a clue to the sense in which the word "*destroy*" is used, see Exodus xxiii. 27. "I will destroy all the people to whom thou shalt come, and I will make all thine enemies *turn their backs unto thee*. Here "*all their enemies*" were to *turn their backs*, and "*all the people*" to be "*destroyed*." Does this mean that God would let all their *enemies* escape, but kill all their *friends*, or that he would *first* kill "all the people" and THEN make them turn their backs in flight, an army of runaway corpses?

The word rendered *backs* is in the original *necks*, and the passage *may* mean, I will make all your enemies turn their necks unto you; that is, be *subject to you as tributaries*, become *denationalized*, their civil polity, state organization, political existence, *destroyed*—their idolatrous temples, altars, images, groves, and all heathen rites *destroyed*; in a word their whole system, national, political, civil, and religious subverted, and the whole people *put under tribute*. 2. If these commands required the unconditional destruction of all the *individuals* of the Canaanites, the Mosaic law was at war with itself, for the directions relative to the treatment of native residents and sojourners, form a large part of it. "The stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself." "If thy brother be waxen poor thou shalt relieve him, yea, though he be a *stranger* or a *sojourner*, that he may live with thee." "Thou shalt not oppress a *stranger*." "Thou shalt not vex a *stranger*." "Judge righteously between every man and his brother, and the *stranger* that is with him," "Ye shall not respect persons in judgment." "Ye shall have one manner of law as well for the *stranger*, as for him of your own country." We find also, that provision was made for them in the cities of refuge, Num. xxxv. 15.—the gleanings of the harvest and vintage were assigned to them, Lev. xix. 9, 10, and xxiii. 22. and 25, 6;—the blessings of the Sabbath, theirs, Ex. xx. 10;—the privilege of offering sacrifices secured Lev. 22, 18; and stated religious instruction provided for them. Deut. xxxi. 9, 12. Now does this *same law* authorize and appoint the

individual extermination of those very persons, whose lives and general interests it so solicitously protects? These laws were promulgated to the Israelites, long *before* they entered Canaan; and they must of necessity have inferred from them that a multitude of the inhabitants of the land would *remain in it* subject to them.

3. *We argue that these commands did not require the INDIVIDUAL destruction of the Canaanites unconditionally, from the fact that the most pious Israelites never seem to have so regarded them.* Joshua was selected by God, as the leader of Israel to execute his threatnings upon Canaan, and take possession of the land. He was God's executioner elected and commissioned for this specific object. He was invested with no *discretionary* power. God's commands were his *official instructions*. Going *beyond* them, "would have been impious usurpation. A refusal to carry them out would have been rebellion and treason. For neglecting to obey in *every particular*, and in only a *single* instance, God's command respecting the Amelekites, Saul was rejected from being king.

Now if God commanded the individual destruction of all the Canaanitish nations, Joshua *disobeyed him in every instance*. For at the death of Joshua, not one of these nations had been extirpated.—They are all enumerated, and the Israelites still "*dwelt among them.*" See Judges i. 5. and yet we are told that "Joshua was full of the spirit of the Lord and of wisdom, Deut. 34. 9. (Of course he could not have been ignorant of the import of those commands,)—that "the Lord was with him," Josh. vi. 27; and that he "left nothing undone of all that the Lord commanded Moses;" and further that "he took all that land." Joshua xi. 15—23. Also that "the Lord gave unto Israel all the land which he swore to give unto their fathers, and they possessed it and dwelt therein, and there *stood not a man* of *all* their enemies before them." "The Lord delivered *all their* enemies into their hand," &c.

How can this testimony be reconciled with itself, if we suppose that the command to *destroy* enjoined *individual* extermination, and the command to *drive out*, enjoined the unconditional expulsion of individuals from the country, rather than their expulsion from the *possession* or *ownership* of it, as the lords of the soil? It is true, multitudes of the Canaanites were slain, but in every case it was in conse-

quence of their refusing to surrender their territory to the possession of the Israelites. Not a solitary case can be found in which a Canaanite was killed or driven out of the country who *acquiesced* in the transfer of the territory of Canaan, and its sovereignty, from the inhabitants of the land to the Israelites. Witness the case of Rahab and all her kindred, and the inhabitants of Gibeon, Chephirah, Beeroth, and Kerjathjearim.* The Canaanites knew full well the miracles wrought by God in Egypt, at the Red Sea, in the wilderness, and at the passage of Jordan. They knew that their land had been transferred to the Israelites, and that too as a judgment upon them for their sins.—See Joshua ii. 9—11, and ix. 9, 10, 24. Many of them were awed by these wonders, saw God in them, and offered no resistance to the confiscation of their territory. But the great majority fiercely resisted, defied the God of the armies of Israel, and came out to battle. They occupied the *fortified cities*, were the most *inveterate* heathen—the *aristocracy* of idolatry, the *kings*, the *nobility* and *gentry*, the *priests*, with their crowds of satellites, and retainers that aided in the performance of idolatrous rites, the *military forces*, with the chief profligates and lust-panders of both sexes. Every attentive reader of the Old Testament will at once recall many facts corroborating this supposition. Such as the multitudes of *tributaries* residing unmolested in the various tribes of Israel, and that too

*Perhaps it will be objected that the preservation of the Gibeonites, and of Rahab and her kindred, was a violation of the command of God. We answer, if it had been we might expect some such intimation. If God had straitly commanded them to *exterminate all the Canaanites*, their pledge to save them alive, was neither a repeal of the statute, nor absolution for the breach of it. If *unconditional destruction* was the import of the command, would God have permitted such an act to pass without severe rebuke? Would he have established such a precedent when Israel had hardly passed the threshold of Canaan, and was then striking the first blow of a half century war? What if they *had* passed their word to Rahab and the Gibeonites? Was that more binding upon them than God's command? So Saul seems to have passed his word to Agag; yet Samuel hewed him in pieces, because in saving his life Saul had violated God's command. This same Saul appears to have put the same construction on the command to destroy the inhabitants of Canaan, that is generally put upon it now. We are told that he sought to slay the Gibeonites "in his zeal for the children of Israel and Judah." God sent upon Israel a three years' famine, as a punishment for this act. In assigning the reason for it, He says, "it is for Saul and his bloody house, because he slew the Gibeonites." When David enquired of them what atonement he should make, they say "the man that consumed us, and that devised against us, that we should be destroyed from *remaining in any of the coasts of Israel*, let seven men of his sons be delivered," &c. 2 Samuel xxii. 1—6.

when these tribes had "waxed strong," and the uttermost nations quaked at the terror of their name.

The large numbers of the Canaanites as well as the Philistines and others, who became proselytes, and joined themselves to the Hebrews—as the Nethenims, Uriah the Hittite, one of David's memorable "thirty-seven"—Rahab, who married one of the princes of Judah—Ittai, with his six hundred Gittites—David's body guard, "faithful among the faithless."—2 Sam. xv. 18, 21. Obedom the Gittite, who was adopted into the tribe of Levi.—Compare 2 Sam. vi. 10, 11, with 1 Chron. xv. 18, and 1 Chron. xxvi. 45. Cases of Jaziz, and Obil,—1 Chron. xxvi. 30, 31, 33. Jephunneh, the father of Caleb—the Kenite, reckoned in the genealogies of the tribe of Judah, and the one hundred and fifty thousand Canaanites, employed by Solomon in the building of the Temple.*

Add to these, the fact that the most memorable miracle on record, was wrought for the salvation of a portion of those very Canaanites, and for the destruction of those who would exterminate them.—Joshua x. 12—14. Further—the terms used in the directions of God to the Israelites, regulating their disposal of the Canaanites, such as, "drive out," "put out," "cast out," "expel," "dispossess," &c. seem used interchangeably with "consume," "destroy," "overthrow," &c. and thus indicate the sense in which the latter words are used.

As an illustration of the meaning generally attached to these and similar terms, when applied to the Canaanites in Scripture we refer the reader to the history of the Amalekites. In Ex. xxvii. 14. God says "I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amelek from under heaven,"—In Deut. xxv. 19. "Thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amelek from under heaven; thou shalt not forget it."—In 1 Sam. xv. 2, 3. Smite Amelek and *utterly destroy* all that they have, and spare them not, but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep." In the seventh and eighth verses of the same chapter we are told, "Saul smote the Amalekites, and took Agag the king of the Amalekites

* If the Canaanites were devoted by God to individual and unconditional extermination, to have employed them in the erection of the temple,—what was it but the climax of impiety? As well might they pollute its altars with swine's flesh, or make their sons pass through the fire to Moloch.

alive, and UTTERLY DESTROYED ALL THE PEOPLE with the edge of the sword. In verse 20, Saul says "I have obeyed the voice of the Lord, and have brought Agag the king of Amalek, and have *utterly destroyed* the Amelekites."

In 1 Sam. 30th chapter, we find the Amalekites at war again, marching an army into Israel, and sweeping every thing before them—and all this in hardly more than twenty years after they had *all been* UTTERLY DESTROYED!

Deut. xx. 16. 17, will probably be quoted as conclusive, against the preceding view. "*But of the cities of these people which the Lord thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth: but thou shalt utterly destroy them; namely the Hittites, and the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee.*" We argue that this command to exterminate, did not include all the individuals of the Canaanitish nations, but only the inhabitants of the *cities*, (and even those conditionally,) for the following reasons.

I. Only the inhabitants of *cities* are specified,—“of the *cities* of these people thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth.” The reasons for this wise discrimination were, no doubt,

1. Cities then, as now, were pest-houses of vices—they reeked with abominations little practiced in the country. On this account, their influence would be far more perilous to the Israelites than that of the country.

2. These cities were the centers of idolatry—the residences of idolatrous priests with their retinues of the baser sort. There were their temples, and altars, and idols, without number. Even their buildings, streets, and public walks were so many visibilities of idolatry. The reason assigned in the 18th verse for exterminating them, strengthens the idea,—“*that they teach you not to do after all the abominations which they have done unto their gods.*” This would be a reason for exterminating *all* the nations and individuals *around* them, as all were idolaters; but God permitted and even commanded them, in certain cases, to spare the inhabitants. Contact with *any* of them would be perilous,—with the inhabitants of the *cities* peculiarly, and of the *Canaanitish* cities preeminently so.

It will be seen from the 10th and 11th verses that those cities which accepted the offer of peace were to be spared. "*When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it. And it shall be, if it make the answer of peace and open unto thee, then it shall be that all the people that is found therein, shall be* TRIBUTARIES *unto thee, and they shall* SERVE *thee.*"—Deuteronomy xx. 10, 11. These verses contain the general rule prescribing the method in which cities were to be summoned to surrender, and give the whole process in detail.

1. The offer of peace—if it was accepted, the inhabitants became *tributaries*—if it was rejected and they came out against Israel in battle the *men* were to be killed, and the women and little ones saved alive. See Deuteronomy xx. 12, 13, 14. The 15th verse restricts their lenient treatment in saving the wives and little ones of those who fought them, to the inhabitants of the cities *afar off*. The 16th verse gives directions about the disposal of the inhabitants of Canaanitish cities, after they had taken them. Instead of sparing the women and children, they were to save alive nothing that breathed. The common mistake has been in taking it for granted, that the command in the 15th verse, "Thus shalt thou do unto all the cities," &c. refers to the *whole system of directions preceding*, commencing with the 10th verse, whereas it manifestly refers only to the *inflictions* specified in the verses immediately preceding, viz., the 12th, 13th, and 14th, and thus makes a distinction between those *Canaanitish* cities that *fought* and the cities *afar off* that fought—in the one case destroying the males and females, and in the other the *males* only. The offer of peace and the *conditional preservation*, were as really guaranteed to *Canaanitish* cities as to others. Their inhabitants were not to be exterminated *unless they came out against Israel in battle*. But let us settle this question by the "*law and the testimony.*" Joshua xix. 19, 20.—"*There was not a city that made peace with the children of Israel save the Hivites, the inhabitants of Gibeon; all others they took in battle. For it was of the Lord to harden their hearts, that they should* COME OUT AGAINST ISRAEL IN BATTLE, *that he might destroy them utterly, and that they might have no favor, but that he might destroy them as the Lord commanded Moses.*"

That is, if they had *not* come out against Israel in battle they would have had "favor" shown them, and would not have been "*destroyed utterly*."

A careful examination of the entire history of the Canaanites, and a comparison of all the passages, which define their relations to the Israelites, together with all the directions given as to their treatment, compared with the attending circumstances, go to show, that the great design of God was to *transfer the territory* of the Canaanites to the Israelites, and along with it, *absolute sovereignty in every respect*; to annihilate the existing political organizations, the civil polity and jurisprudence, and their system of religion with all its rites and appendages; and to substitute therefor, a pure theocracy, administered by Jehovah, with the Israelites as His representatives and agents. Those who *resisted* the execution of Jehovah's purpose, so long known and publicly declared were to be *killed*: while those who quietly submitted to it, were to be *spared*. All had the choice of these alternatives, either *free egress* out of the land;* or, if they remained in it, *acquiescence in the decree*, with life and residence in the land as *tributaries*, under the protection of the government: or *resistance* to the execution of the decree, with *death*. That *all* were permitted to remain in the land, who refrained from idolatrous rites and demeaned themselves as peaceable citizens; and those *only* driven out or destroyed, who willfully persisted in an opposite course—is plain from divers passages of Scripture. See Jeremiah xii. 16, 17.—"And it shall come to pass, if they will diligently learn the ways of my people, to swear by my name, the Lord liveth, as they taught my people to swear by Baal; *then shall they be built in the midst of my people.*"

* Suppose that all the Canaanitish nations, when they heard of all the wonders wrought for the Israelites, and that they were, on their march, commissioned by God to take possession of Canaan, had abandoned their territory and migrated to Æthiopia and settled there. Would the Israelites have been obliged by the command to have hunted them out, and chased them to the ends of the earth until every Canaanite was destroyed? It is too preposterous for belief, and yet it follows legitimately from that construction, which interprets the terms "consume," "destroy," "destroy utterly," &c., to mean unconditional individual extermination.

[It is quite unnecessary to say that the preceding Inquiry is merely an *outline*. Whoever *reads* it, needs no such information. Its original design embraced a much wider range of general topics, and subordinate heads, and corroboratives with an examination of various additional objections, based upon passages in the Old Testament, besides an Inquiry into the teachings of the New Testament on the same subject, and the alleged sanction of slavery in the example and instructions of Christ and the Apostles. To have carried out and filled up the outline, in conformity with the plan upon which the preceding article was sketched, and the former part of it written, would have swelled it to a volume. On that account, and for another reason, *providential* and *imperative*, much of the foregoing has been thrown into the form of a mere skeleton of heads, or rather a series of *indices*, to trains of thought and classes of proof, which, however limited or imperfect, may perhaps, afford some facilities to those who have little leisure for minute and protracted investigation.]

THE CRUELTY OF SLAVERY.

The attentive readers of Anti-Slavery publications are well aware that the instances of greatest cruelty, are uniformly given *on the testimony of slaveholders themselves*. So far as our own editorial labors have extended, we have abstained from giving the more outrageous violations of humanity, unless able to quote from southern publications, or to refer to the actors by name. Were we to tell of hunting down *men* with *dogs*, *burning* them to death by inches, with slow fires, and *shooting* strangers with small shot, on the suspicion of their being run away slaves, on the mere testimony of some northern traveler, we should at once lose the credence of the majority of our readers. But who can forbid us to republish the statements of southern men themselves? Who can refuse to believe the official publication of a chivalrous South Carolinian? The following we take from the Georgia Constitutionalist of a recent date:—

AIKEN, (S. C.) December 20, 1836.

“*To the Editors of the Constitutionalist*—

I have just returned from an Inquest I held over the dead body of a negro man, a runaway, that was shot near the South Edisto, in this District, (Barnwell,) on Saturday morning last. He came to his death by his own recklessness.

He refused to be taken alive—and said that other attempts to take him had been made, and he was determined that he would not be taken. When taken he was nearly naked, had a large dirk or knife and a heavy club. He was at first, (when those who were in pursuit of him found it absolutely necessary,) shot at with small shot, with the intention of merely crippling him. He was shot at several times, and at last he was so disabled as to be compelled to surrender. He kept in the run of a creek in a very dense swamp all the time that the neighbors were in pursuit of him. As soon as the negro was taken, the best medical aid was procured, but he died on the same evening. One of the witnesses at the Inquisition stated that the negro boy said that he was from Mississippi, and belonged to so many persons, he did not know who his master was, but again he said his master's name was *Brown*. He said his own name was Sam, and, when asked by another witness who his master was, he muttered something like Augusta or Augustine. The boy was apparently above 35 or 40 years of age, about six feet high, slightly yellow in the face, very long beard or whiskers, and very stout built, and a stern countenance; and appeared to have been runaway a long time.

WILLIAM H. PRITCHARD,

Coroner, (Ex. Officio,) Barnwell Dist., S. C.

✂ The Mississippi and other papers will please copy the above."

REMARKS.

1. This murder was perpetrated by persons who pretended to no claim of property in the individual victim. They *suspected* him of *belonging* to somebody.

2. It was not committed in the heat of passion, but in cold-blooded regard to the *system* which makes men *property*. There was great care to take the man with as little injury as possible to the *property*, but no care for the rights or feelings of the *man*.

3. The negro well understood the odds against him, yet he ran the risk of small shot and large, rather than be dragged into slavery.

4. This publication is evidently called forth by a tender regard to the feelings of the *master*, if master the poor man had, and is designed to show that honorable being, that though the murderers regarded not the life of his *man*, they did all they could, both by "small shot" and "medical aid," to save the life of his *property*.

5. This "boy" was "slightly yellow in the face," of a "stern countenance," &c., hence he may have been the son of one of the southern signers of the great "compact!"

6. This is an official statement, made unblushingly, and published without comment, as of an every day occurrence. It shows the tone of southern feeling; it stands the exponent of southern practice. The murder was perpetrated by a whole neighborhood as a systematic business affair.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

WEST INDIA APPRENTICESHIP. The Select Committee of the British Parliament appointed "to inquire into the working of the apprenticeship system in the colonies, the condition of the Apprentices, and the laws and regulations affecting them," have concluded their labors by a report in which they urge certain modifications of existing laws, "express their conviction, that nothing could be more unfortunate than any occurrence which would have a tendency to unsettle the minds

of either class with regard to the fixed determination of the Imperial Parliament to preserve inviolate both parts of the solemn engagement by which the services of the apprenticed laborer were secured to his employer for a definite period, and under specified restrictions:—"So the mis-called apprenticeship will probably have its full course, notwithstanding the masters' forfeiture of their claim to what should never have been granted them. The committee say, that "In the evidence which they have received, they find abundant proof of the general good conduct of the apprentices, and of their willingness to work for wages whenever they are fairly and considerately treated by their employers. It is, indeed, fully proved that the labor, thus voluntarily performed by the negro, is more effective than that which was obtained from him while in a state of slavery, or which is now given to his employer during the period for which he is compelled to work as an apprentice. The mutual suspicion and irritation of the different classes of the community appear to be gradually subsiding; and, on the part of the negro population, industrious habits, and the desire of moral and physical improvement, seem to be gaining ground!"

The following are a series of resolutions passed at the meeting of the Wesleyan Missionaries, (twenty-five in number,) of the Antigua District, assembled at St. Johns, Antigua, Feb. 7, 1837.

1. "That the emancipation of the slaves of the West Indies, while it was an act of undoubted justice to that oppressed people, has operated most favorably in furthering the triumphs of the gospel, by removing one prolific source of unmerited suspicion of religious teachers, and thus opening a door to their more extensive labors and usefulness—by furnishing a greater portion of time for the service of the negro, and thus preventing the continuance of unavoidable Sabbath desecrations in labor and neglect of the means of grace—and in its operation as a stimulus to proprietors and other influential gentlemen, to encourage religious education and the wide dissemination of the Scriptures, as an incentive to industry and good order.

2. "That while the above statements are true with reference to all the islands, even where the system of apprenticeship prevails, they are especially applicable to Antigua, where the results of the great measure of entire freedom, so humanely and judiciously granted by the legislature, cannot be contemplated without the most devout thanksgivings to Almighty God.

3. "That we regard with much gratification, the great diminution among all classes in these islands, of the most unchristian prejudice of color, the total absence of it in the government and ordinances of the churches of God with which we are connected, and the prospect of its complete removal, by the abolition of slavery, by the increased diffusion of general knowledge, and of that religion which teaches to "honor *all* men," and to love our neighbor as ourselves."

GREAT BRITAIN AND TEXAS.—A motion has been made and lost by a minority of thirteen, in the British House of Commons, to have copies of the correspondence between the government of Great Britain and that of the United States and Mexico laid before that body. Mr. Hoy, the mover, spoke of the danger of Texas becoming a portion of the United States, and said,

"When Mexico declared herself an independent state, Mr. Canning had entered into a treaty with that country, by which the Mexicans consented to abolish slavery in every portion of their dominions. This stipulation, with regard to the abolition of Slavery, having been mutually agreed to between the contracting parties, Great Britain was bound to cooperate with Mexico, for the purpose of securing the desired abolition. It was, however, quite notorious that an importation of slaves to an enormous extent had been recently carried on from the United States into Texas."

Mr. O'Connell said, and we honor him for saying it,

"Therevolt of Texas was founded upon nothing else than the abolition of Slavery by the Mexican government. The Mexican government of 1824 pronounced that no one born in the territory of Mexico after that year, should be born in Slavery; and in 1829 they went farther, and abolished Slavery altogether, upon which immediately followed the revolt in the province of Texas. That revolt was actually the consequence of abolishing Slavery in Mexico. The United States would not think of peopling that country with white men. What, then, were we to think of those who settled there upon the speculation of increasing the number of slaves—that most horrible of all traffics? He would say that they ought to be degraded in the eyes of every man of feeling. It was revolting to think of it—to think of breeding up human beings for the purpose of making them slaves and selling them—of stocking farms, as it were, and estimating the probable number of women necessary to be kept for a certain number of men—of breeding up children as a matter of speculation, just as they would do sheep, and calculating how soon they would be ripe for the market. It was a blot which no country but America would suffer to stain their history. No nation was ever degraded by such a crime except your high spirited North American republic.

GEORGE THOMPSON, the devoted friend of the slave, is lecturing in Scotland with undiminished ardor—increased, if that were possible. He has lately replied to Prof. Stowe's calumnies. The reader is referred to the Emancipator for April 6, 1837.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS.

The first session of the 24th Congress honored the right of petition in regard to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, by the early appointment of a Committee headed by Mr. Pinckney of South Carolina, to which all papers touching the agitating subject were to be referred, and which was to remain stagnant as a sink till the end of the session, when it was to overflow with such tremendous force, as to put abolitionism forever at rest. In due time the grand disgorgement took place in the shape of Mr. Pinckney's report. The whole of it was water spilt upon the ground. We are inclined to think few persons took the trouble to read it, and those who did, found in it no reason why they should not again petition Congress to "establish justice" in the territory which lies under its "*exclusive legislation*." But in the following resolution appended to the report, (and passed, ayes 117, noes 68,) every honest freeman found a reason why he *should* petition.

"Resolved, that all Petitions, Memorials, Resolutions and Propositions, relating in any way, or to any extent whatever, to the subject of Slavery, shall without being either printed or referred, be laid on the table, and that no further action whatever shall be had thereon."

Nothing could have been less soothing to the spirit of abolitionism. There were men ready to ask the 24th Congress how long it intended to persist in this outrageous violation of the Constitution. Petitions were again poured in at the opening of the second session. The speaker of the House of Representatives, either because he had too much conscience, or because his party was in need of abolition votes, decided that the resolution of Mr. Pinckney applied only to the session in which it was passed. On the 18th of January the same infamous resolution, without any material alteration, was brought up by Mr. Hawes of Kentucky,

and driven through by the beetle and wedge process of the *previous question*. (Ayes 129, noes 69.) Such was the fate of 110,000 petitioners, praying for the mere naked "inalienable rights" of man in the common capital of this *free country*!

It hardly need be said that this resolution tramples on the Constitution. That instrument ordains that the right of petition shall not be *abridged*. Yet the House of Representatives have resolved that on one subject, confessedly within their power, they will hear nothing from the people, no matter how great the number, even if a majority were to petition.

The Hon. John Quincy Adams has well earned the thanks of the human race by his firm and manful opposition to this usurpation of the spirit of Slavery. Neither threats of assassination nor the more dreadful enginery of scoffs and sneers have driven him from his post. The question raised by him, whether a petition from *slaves* came within the scope of the gagging resolution, opened the hearts of the slaveholders, and showed on what terms we are permitted to live and breathe by our southern masters. Freemen will not fail to be edified, and to learn the value of that "dignity," which the House, by a solemn vote, affirmed would be impaired by listening to the petition of a slave.

The state of Massachusetts has nobly stood by Mr. Adams and his colleagues. Her legislature has spoken out in a firm voice against the usurpation of Congress; and it deserves to be remembered that her Senate passed *unanimously* a resolution declaring the right of Congress to abolish Slavery and the slave-trade in the District of Columbia, and asserting that the early exercise of the right is demanded by the opinion of an enlightened world and by humanity. This, with the noble message of Gov. Ritner of Pennsylvania, cannot but rejoice the heart of every friend of the slave.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

A practical treatise on THE LAW OF SLAVERY; being a compilation of all the decisions made on that subject, in the several courts of the United States, and state courts. With copious notes and references to the statutes and other authorities, systematically arranged. By JACOB D. WHEELER, ESQ. COUNSELLOR AT LAW. New York, Allan Pollock, jr.; New Orleans, Benjamin Levy; 1837. pp. 476. Price \$5 00.

The public is here presented with a flood of judgments in which justice seldom gets her nose above the surface. The book will be useful to abolitionists as well as slaveholders.

THE NARRATIVE OF CHARLES BALL. Just published, a new edition of this most interesting work, by John S. Taylor, Brick Church Chapel, New York, and for sale at the Anti-Slavery Office. Price \$1.25. [See review in our first volume, page 375; and cover of the present number.] This work will outlive slavery, by a whole eternity.

THE SLAVE, OR MEMOIRS OF ARCHY MOORE. Boston, John H. Eastburn, Printer, 1836. 2 vols. 12 mo. pp. 170 each. Price \$1 25.

This is stubborn truth in the dress of fiction. Those who are not troubled with *hearts and consciences* will think it a foolish book. But, whoever else treats it as a mere fiction, slaveholders will not.

Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine.

No. VIII.—For July, 1837.

WHY have all the additions to the original territory of the United States been for the increase of slavery and the slave representation? Why are we likely still to receive additions to the slave-holding territory, while we are in danger of suffering subtraction from the free? Because tyrants are abroad and the friends of freedom are asleep. The "free states" are about to be chained, not because they have not the constitutional and the numerical power to circumscribe slavery, and stop the intestine motions by which it grows, but because they have not the will. It is a thing called "northern enterprise," of which we are prouder than we have good reason to be, which nurses the system of labor peculiar to the South, and continues to profit by the *cow-hide currency* in which southern capitalists pay their laborers.

The annexation of Texas can be prevented only by the immediate rallying against it of the whole North. There will hardly be one vote to exclude it south of the Potomac and Ohio. Its admission to the Union will give to slaveholders the power to carry any measure in the federal Congress, which they may think expedient for the stability of their "domestic institutions,"—and to gain this very advantage they encouraged the insurrectionary war. It simply remains to be seen whether there is virtue enough at the North to abstain from the consummation of this splendid piece of robbery—liberty enough to spurn this gilded yoke.

Let it be remembered that a beautiful system, born of the necessities of slavery, and denominated *Lynch Law*, stands justified at the South by high authorities, both ecclesiastical and legal. It was a mode of the sovereign white people's

action, supplementary to the laws. By a reinforcement of the laws against freedom of thought, however, the southern states are seeking to dispense with the aid of a supplement which is confessedly, in many cases, of awkward application. What will hinder them, when by the annexation of Texas they have secured a southern majority in the federal legislature, and bribed half the North into the bargain, from crushing the very life of liberty throughout the entire republic, in the Anaconda coils of our idolized Union? It requires no gift of prophecy to foretell, that after the slaveholding South is made a third larger, whosoever shall presume, even among the granite hills of New Hampshire, or the pines of the Penobscot, to question the justice of slavery, in an "agitating" way, will receive at the hands of a United States' Judge the same sort of justice that Amos Dresser received from a Lynch Committee at Nashville.

Let it be remembered too, that a northern President, paving the way to this result, has pledged himself to act with the South while in the minority, against any national interference with slavery, however constitutional it may be. Is it to be supposed that he will strive to hinder the South from getting the majority? Is it to be supposed that *he* will oppose the acquisition of Texas, who, with the chains of two and a half millions clanking in his ears, and the stars of seven new slave states staining the banner above his head, had the hardihood to declare, in his Inaugural Address, "with our increase has gone hand in hand the progress of just principles: *the privileges, civil and religious, of the humblest individual are still sacredly protected*"? No.

If our nation is saved, it must be done by a rallying of the North before the first of September. Let it be distinctly stated to the slaveholders that, *if they will grasp Texas, they may have their plunder, their Mexican war, and their "peculiar institutions," to themselves.*

THE
QUARTERLY
ANTI-SLAVERY MAGAZINE.

VOL. II.

JULY, 1837.

NO. 4.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

THE Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, in presenting their Fourth Annual Report, would pause to drop a tear over the graves of the venerable GEORGE BENSON, one of the Society's Vice Presidents; THOMAS SHIPLEY and EDWIN P. ATLEE, two of its most active and devoted managers. Others, too, whose prayers and toils have mingled with ours, have just finished their course, and left to this precious cause the testimony of their dying love.* These solemn monitions from Him in whose hand is the life of every living thing, teach us that the time is short in which we can plead for His outraged and down-trodden poor. But the events of the year are well adapted to assure us, that our pleading, if humbly and faithfully persevered in, will not be in vain.

So far as reports have reached the Committee, the number of societies organized since the last anniversary is 483, making the whole number 1006. Flourishing State Auxiliaries have been organized in Michigan and Pennsylvania, while those already existing in seven other states have prosecuted their labors with increasing zeal, energy and success. The number of presses friendly to Anti-Slavery doctrines, and wholly or in part devoted to their propagation, has been greatly multiplied; while opposing presses have, in numerous instances, given marked indications of their sensibility to an approaching turn in the tide of public opinion and feeling.

*Among these, deserve to be mentioned especially, Miss CAROLINE WHELOCK, of Washington County, N. Y., and Miss ANN GREENE CHAPMAN, of Boston. The former left to the American Anti-Slavery Society a legacy of eight hundred dollars, and the latter, of one thousand.

The amount of funds placed in the hands of the Committee has not been so great as was expected, at the last anniversary. From the reports of the Treasurer and Publishing Agent it will appear that the total receipts have been \$38,304 89, being an increase over the receipts of last year of \$12,438 59. Of this amount a much larger proportion than last year has been expended on the support of living agents. The issues from the press during the year have been as follows, viz. :

Bound volumes,	7,877
Tracts and pamphlets,	47,250
Circulars, etc.	4,100
Prints,	10,490
Anti-Slavery Magazine,	9,000
Slaves Friend,	130,150
Anti-Slavery Record,	103,000
Human Rights,	189,400
Emancipator,	217,000
Total,	718,267

There have been appointed by the Committee, in the course of the year, but chiefly within the last six months, upwards of seventy agents, sixty-five of whom have been in the service of the Society for longer or shorter periods. The aggregate amount of their labors has been thirty-two years. And well and faithfully have they done their work, lecturing with a frequency and energy which nothing but strong feeling and a thorough conviction of the importance and urgency of their righteous cause can have sustained. The success which has attended their efforts is most marked and cheering.

Three of the agents have devoted themselves exclusively to the business of encouraging our colored brethren in the free states, in their laudable efforts to rise, by good education of their children and virtuous industry, above the cruel prejudice which is crushing them in the dust, and through their degradation darkening the despair of the slave. The statistics of our colored population, their grievances and the obstacles which have opposed their advancement have been searched out. They have been encouraged to form societies for mutual assistance and improvement, to support schools, to put their children where they can acquire trades, and to apply themselves to more substantial and independent oc-

cupations than those to which they are chiefly devoted in our large cities. In the western states they are induced to purchase, clear and cultivate the public lands; and the good effect of their zeal and success in this enterprise, both upon themselves and their white neighbors, begins to be happily developed. The agent in Ohio, who, for the sake of encouraging colored men to become cultivators of the soil, has placed his head quarters in the wilderness twelve miles from any Post Office, writes, "People are coming and buying every week. My wife gets new plots from the land office, every now and then, that she may be able to give them directions where to look for lots." He says of the colored people of that state, whom he has laboriously searched out, "The abolition breeze that has blown over them has been like the Spirit of God upon Adam's lifeless clay." The following among other facts, which he states, show how the new life manifests itself. "One man, (in Springfield,) who was a slave till he was about forty years old, has built a school house at his own expense, on his own lot, which is occupied by a school with thirty scholars." "J. Wise (in the vicinity of Springfield) bought himself in Virginia, he rents a farm—raised 1000 bushels of corn last year, etc. I met him driving his team of four horses to the village with a load of brick. He has two children yet in slavery." "William Roberts also rents a farm—raised 4000 bushels of corn last year." "Nimrod Morgan, a blacksmith, owns his shop, house and lot." "I have found some very good farmers. One man in Butler county, has taken the premium at the agricultural fair for three years, for the best sheep. I should consider it an honor to any man to have so well cultivated a farm as he has. I have noticed that such men have generally the good will and respect of the whole neighborhood where they reside." Thus let colored men become farmers and strike their roots deep in our free soil, and they will infallibly rise above that prejudice which now makes us even hesitate to publish these simple facts, lest they should draw forth mobocratic vengeance to defeat the experiment.

The labors of the two agents on the eastern side of the mountains have been specially directed to the business of encouraging the colored population in our larger towns, to provide for the education of their children, both in letters and trades; to organize Temperance Societies—to support a

paper specially devoted to their benefit, and which is now edited in this city by one of their own number—and to assist so far as is in their power by direct efforts, the cause of their enslaved brethren. In another place facts will be developed, showing the high importance of this part of our enterprise and its intimate connection with the abolition of slavery.

One agent has been employed to investigate the condition and prospects of the colored people in Upper Canada, where he finds a population of about 10,000, almost entirely fugitives from American oppression. Having crossed the line with no other wealth than their own bodies and souls, many of them have made themselves quite comfortable, and some have become even wealthy. Several schools have sprung up among them by the efforts of the agent. Full and satisfactory evidence of their good behaviour and value as citizens has been given by the highest civil authorities, and by men of standing of different sects and parties.

The following letters were received by the agent, in reply to his inquiries, from gentlemen in Toronto, whose character is too well known to need any description.

1st.—From Hon. R. G. DUNLAP, Member of the Provincial Parliament.

House of Assembly, Toronto, January 27, 1837.

DEAR SIR,—Permit me to assure you that I feel much pleasure in replying to your communication of yesterday, and in recording my testimony, whether in my private capacity as a subject, or in my public as a magistrate and representative of the people, it gives me infinite satisfaction to say, that after much observation and some experience, I have arrived at this conclusion, viz. that there are not in his Majesty's dominions, a more loyal, honest, industrious, temperate, and independent class of citizens than the colored people of Upper Canada. Go on therefore, my dear sir, in your work of charity, and let us pray fervently to the Most High, that he will look down with compassion on the degraded children of Africa, and lead them as he did his chosen people of old, from your modern Egypt of oppression.

I remain, dear sir, your's very sincerely,

R. G. DUNLAP,

Captain of R. N., M. P. for the County of Huron.

2d.—From W. L. MACKENZIE, Esq.

Toronto, January 30, 1837.

SIR,—In reply to your inquiries, I beg to offer as my opinion, with much diffidence, 1st. That nearly all of them are opposed to every species of reform in the civil institutions of the colony—they are so extravagantly loyal to the Executive, that to the utmost of their power they uphold all the abuses of government, and support those who profit by them. 2d. As a people they are as well behaved as a majority of the whites, and perhaps more temperate. 3d. To your third question I would say, not "more numerous." 4th. Cases in which colored people ask public charity are rare, as far as I can recollect. I am opposed to slavery, whether of whites or blacks, in every form. I wish to live long enough to see the people of this continent, of the humblest classes, educated and free, and held in respect, according to their conduct and attainments, without reference to country,

color, or worldly substance. But I regret that an unfounded fear of a union with the United States on the part of the colored population should have induced them to oppose reform and free institutions in this colony, whenever they have had the power to do so. The apology I make for them in this matter is, that they have not been educated as freemen.

I am, your respectful humble servant,

W. L. MACKENZIE.

3d.—From JOHN H. DUNN, Esq.

SIR,—In acknowledging the receipt of your letter of the 26th instant, containing certain inquiries relating to the people of color in this city, I have much pleasure in affording my testimony for the information of the society of which you state yourself to be the agent, at the same time, begging you will consider my observations as strictly applicable to the people of color within this city and immediate neighbourhood, to which alone my knowledge extends. In reply to query No. 1, I believe them to be truly loyal subjects of the government. 2d. As a people, I have no reason to question their honesty or industry, and as far as my observations serve me, they appear to be both temperate and well behaved. 3d. I am not aware that criminal cases are more numerous with them than with others in proportion to their numbers. But with respect to your 4th question, I wish to be more explicit and to remark, that although I have been in the habit of daily contributing my assistance to a vast number of destitute poor, ever since my residence in this province, now seventeen years, I do not remember ever having been solicited for alms by more than one or two people of color during the whole course of that period.


I am, your respectful humble servant,

JOHN H. DUNN,

Receiver General, Upper Canada.

Many of these self-emancipated people are found to be very intelligent, and capable of throwing much light on the house of bondage from which they have escaped. Their statements of the horrors of slavery, which they have felt and seen, are so full, definite, and circumstantial—with names, dates, and places—that unless contradicted by more than a mere denial, they must command our belief.

Several flourishing Anti-Slavery Societies have been formed in the Province, to co-operate with us in the moral warfare, and to bar out that prejudice which some of our white republicans are industriously exporting.

One agent has been exclusively devoted to the dissemination of Anti-Slavery principles among children and youth—and with gratifying success. On looking into our present generation of revised and improved school-books, it will be seen, that those faithful finger-boards which used to point the young mind towards righteousness and liberty, and away from  SLAVERY, as from a den of abominations, are mostly torn down, and in their stead, in some of the popular reading books and geographies,* pleasant lanes are

* See, especially, Goodrich's Universal Geography, p. 263 and onward, and Balbi's School Geography, p. 113, where it is unequivocally asserted, that the slaves are generally *well treated*, and not overtaxed.

opened, through which "Southern institutions" look beautiful in the distance. Here is poisoning at the fountain! Had we expended ten times—nay, one hundred times the effort we have to administer the antidote, we could not have been justly chargeable with over-estimating the importance of the measure. Slaveholders dread the young abolitionists more than they do the old.

About the last of November, two agents sailed for the West Indies, with instructions to gather all the facts within their reach, which go to illustrate the working of the British abolition act of 1834, both in regard to the unqualified immediate emancipation of Antigua, and the apprenticeship of the other islands. They have visited Antigua, Barbadoes, Jamaica, and some other islands, and have every where been furnished with the best facilities for investigation. Important results of their labors have been already laid before the public, and others will follow in due time, going to set the fitness of slaves for freedom, and the expediency of immediate, in preference to gradual, or partial, or qualified emancipation, in the clearest possible certainty.

The Committee cannot omit to mention, with heartfelt thanks to God, the important aid the cause has received from two sisters, from Charleston, S. C.—once the holders of slaves. They have, without reserve, laid themselves on the altar of the cause, at the expense of becoming aliens and outcasts from their native city, and from a large circle of slaveholding relatives and friends. For their constant toil, they have declined receiving any pecuniary compensation. Their touching "appeals," both written and oral, have, we doubt not, kindled a genuine abolition flame in many thousands of hearts. Let them hold on their course, till universal womanhood is rallied in behalf of the bleeding victims of wrong.

Fully aware of the immense importance of British sympathy and concurrence to the cause of Emancipation in the United States, Mr. George Thompson has continued his labors in England and Scotland, with unabated zeal and the most cheering success. Through his agency, British Christians have been correctly informed of the character of American Slavery, and of its relation to the American churches; and consequently memorials and remonstrances have been borne across the Atlantic by every breeze. These faithful and unsparing rebukes have had a most salutary

effect. They were at once so keenly felt, that our pro-slavery Christians resolved on a mighty effort to check George Thompson, and fill the eyes of their trans-atlantic brethren with the dust of their own sophistry. The champion of this worthy enterprise was the Rev. Robert^r Breckinridge, a native of Kentucky—one of the great lights of the Presbyterian church—a divine who is said to have liberated some of his own slaves—and a gradualist. Backed by the highest testimonials, and commended by his own dignity and eloquence, he found in the British public so great a readiness to recoil from the appalling statements of Mr. Thompson to his own soothing varnishes, that he ventured to accept a challenge to a public debate. The discussion took place at Glasgow, and continued five successive evenings. The cause of American prejudice and oppression was managed by Mr. Breckinridge with great adroitness. But his ingenious declamation was met and refuted by American documents, and he was indeed condemned out of his own mouth. Mr. Thompson more than sustained every position which he had taken, by testimony which passed the ordeal of his opponent's closest scrutiny, and conquered the doubts and scruples which had hitherto stood in the way of his own complete success. It was stipulated by the pro-slavery champion, that no decision should be taken immediately after the discussion. The Glasgow Emancipation Society, however, on the 1st of August, took occasion to give its opinion of the matter, when the Rev. Dr. Wardlaw, who presided at the discussion, delivered an eloquent speech, in which were the following words:—"I shrink not from saying of him thus publicly, what I have said more privately in the Committee, that I consider him (Mr. Thompson) in this as in former controversies, as having borne himself, in every respect, creditably to his character and to his cause; to have established, to the full, his previous statements; to have successfully vindicated his trans-atlantic proceedings; to have justified the condemnation of the American Colonization scheme; and to have fairly fastened the guilt of slavery on the government and people of the United States; that I consider him, in a word, as having come out of this seven-times-heated furnace unscathed—without a "hair of his head singed, or the smell of fire having passed upon him." If the meeting are of one mind with me, they will accept the following resolution:—

That in the deliberate judgment of this meeting, the wish announced by Mr. George Thompson, to meet publicly any antagonist, especially any minister of the Gospel from the United States, on the subject of American Slavery, or on any one of the branches of that subject, was dictated by a well-founded consciousness of the integrity of his purpose, and assurance of the correctness of his facts; and that the recent discussion in this city, between him and the Rev. R. J. Breckenridge, of Baltimore, has left, not merely unshaken, but confirmed and augmented their confidence in the rectitude of his principles, the purity of his motives, the propriety of his measures, the fidelity of his statements, and the straight-forward honesty and undaunted intrepidity of his zeal."

The vote on this resolution proved the meeting to be of "one mind" with Dr. Wardlaw; and if we may judge from the extreme bitterness of Mr. Breckinridge's subsequent letters, the same mind now pervades the great majority of British Christians. In his letter to Dr. Wardlaw, he abandons all attempt to justify the American churches, and resorts to recrimination—contented with the miserable consolation of reproaching British Christians with the abuses which exist under British laws. Unfortunately for this last resort, these abuses prove to be no darlings of those who have presumed to rebuke American slavery.

The memorials and remonstrances that come to us across the water, show that slaveholders must not longer expect to be welcomed to the pulpits or the church fellowship of British Christians. Their spirit may be illustrated by the language of the Rev. Mr. Mursell, at a Baptist Missionary meeting in Birmingham, in July, 1836. That gentleman said, with his eye on the abolitionists of America,

"I am happy to say, sir, that we do not stand alone in this opinion, but that a large and reputable body of men on the American continent are under the same conviction, and fired by a similar spirit. *To these we resolve this evening to stretch out the hand of fellowship, and upon them we desire the blessing of heaven may descend.* (Hear, hear.) *We will assist them by rousing on all fitting occasions the British mind—by circulating in every possible way relevant information—by conveying loud and long remonstrance—and by* RETIRING FROM ALL UNION WITH THOSE CHURCHES WHICH REFUSE TO HEARKEN TO OUR CRY. (Cheers.) LET IT BE DISTINCTLY UNDERSTOOD HERE, THAT ON THIS ACCOUNT, THE RELIGIOUS INTERCOURSE BETWEEN THE BAPTISTS IN AMERICA AND THOSE IN ENGLAND IS SUSPENDED. (Immense cheering.)"

The Rev. Dr. Wardlaw, in the speech already referred to, used the following emphatic language:—

"Mr. Breckinridge has said, that if this subject is much meddled with, and especially if such measures are persisted in as those hitherto pursued, there must be a breaking up of the fellowship of American and British Christians. Sir, *I prize that fellowship highly; I prize it individually—*

I prize it collectively. But if it is a fellowship which requires to be maintained by connivance at iniquity and oppression—if it is not to be enjoyed without our entering into a compact to be silent or to be inactive, on topics respecting which we feel it our incumbent and indispensable duty to “lift up our voices like a trumpet,” and show our brethren their sin—THEN I SAY, WITH WHATEVER RELUCTANCE AND WHATEVER PAIN, LET THE FELLOWSHIP CEASE!”

The Southern Religious Telegraph gives an extract of a letter from a Virginian travelling in Scotland, dated Oct. 3d, 1836, which bears a strong testimony to the value of Mr. Thompson's labors. Witness the following:—

“Since my arrival in this country, I have had frequent occasions to witness among the dissenting clergy in particular, their utter abhorrence not only of the *system* of slavery, but also of the *principles* which are advocated by the greater part of Southern Christians. To maintain that Slavery, *in itself considered*, is not necessarily sinful, is in their view so repugnant to every dictate of reason and Scripture, that they can hardly reconcile it with their consciences to believe that the advocate of such a sentiment can ever have experienced the regenerating influence of God's grace. This state of things has been brought about chiefly through the instrumentality of the noted George Thompson. This man, by exaggeration and distortion of isolated facts, has so wrought upon the feelings of the Christians of England and Scotland, that it will require no ordinary sagacity and forbearance, on the part of the *Southern Christians*, to prevent the disruption of that union of feeling and action which has heretofore so happily existed.”

The last remonstrance which has reached us is from Dumbarton and the Vale of Leven, signed by more than **FOUR THOUSAND** of old Scotia's “hardy sons of rustic toil”—

“The wall of fire around her much-loved isle,”

who ask us, with the solemn energy of aggrieved friendship, to wipe the stain from the brow of that American liberty, on which they have loved to gaze, and to wash the “blood of murdered thousands” from the robes of that American Christianity which they long to welcome to the full fellowship of their hearts. What answer shall we return to these four thousand friends?

In the name and strength of God, let George Thompson and his associates go on—let them stamp the brand of felony upon slaveholding, “*in itself considered*,” till the “*sagacity*” of *Southern Christians* shall no longer find the means of hiding it under the sanctity of the church.

Let us now survey the results of Anti-Slavery action at home, and see how far they offer rational encouragement for further labors.

As our object has been to affect the hearts and consciences of men, by an appeal to their religious feelings, we should

naturally look for the most marked results upon truly religious men. A glance at the religious periodicals within the year, must have convinced any one that a great change has been going forward. Not only has the discussion of slavery increased, but a great number of religious bodies have passed and published the most pointedly Anti-Slavery resolutions. Among these cheering testimonies, we notice the following:—

The Worcester Central (Congregational) Association says—

“The usurpation, by man, of dominion over his fellow man, is a sin; which, as it ought not to be done, ought at once to be forever forsaken.”

The Cincinnati (Presbyterian) Synod, of Ohio, recommend to all the churches under their care, “to prepare memorials to the General Assembly, that they will enjoin on the inferior judicatories to enforce discipline upon all those who claim the right of property in their fellowmen.”

The General (Congregational) Conference of Maine, say,

“That slaveholding, as it exists in a portion of these United States, is a great sin against God and man, for which the nation ought to humble itself, and for the speedy and entire removal of which, every Christian ought to pray and use all suitable means within his reach.”

In the Pastoral Address to the Congregational Churches of Strafford County, N. H., the abolition cause is warmly commended, and the following rebuke is dealt to those whom it may concern :

“It is mockery, and the world will see it, and our consciences must feel it, for us to pass votes to supply every family in the United States with the Bible, while with Priest and Levite indifference we pass by and leave destitute three hundred thousand American families.”

The Presbytery of Montrose, Pa., say—

“That the buying, selling, or holding of a slave, is a heinous sin and scandal, and requires the cognizance of the judicatories of the church.”

The General (Congregational) Association of New-York, convened at Brighton, passed the following resolution:—

“*Resolved*, That this Association feel bound, by the principles of our holy religion, to co-operate with our brethren who are laboring by truth, and motive, and prayer, to effect the immediate abolition of slavery in these United States.”

The General Conference of Seventh Day Baptists, assembled at Alfred, N.Y., passed the following resolutions:—

“1. *Resolved*, That we consider the practice of holding human beings as mere goods and chattels, entirely subject to the will of their masters, under a tenure which neither recognizes nor secures their religious rights, but, on the contrary, annuls the marriage contract—destroys parental gov-

ernment—prohibits the education of children—forbids the reading of the Scriptures and assembling for public worship—separates families, by selling husbands, and wives, and parents, and children, whenever the interests or necessity of the master may require it—legalizing the enforcement of labor for individual benefit, without wages, and providing no refuge or protection against cruel treatment or unrighteous commands—is a practice forbidden by the law of God, at variance with the Gospel of Jesus Christ, which no human legislation can render morally right—which no worldly considerations can justify—and which ought to be immediately abandoned.

“2. *Resolved*, That the condition of more than two millions of native Americans, unrighteously held in such bondage, demands the sympathies and prayers of Christians, who are commanded to “remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them.”

The Association of Western New-York (Cong.) say—

“That Slavery, as it exists in the United States, is a sin against God, and a flagrant violation of the rights of man; and that the duty, safety, and interest of all concerned, requires its utter and immediate abolition.”

The Washington Union Baptist Association, Washington County, N. Y., say—

“That the system of *slavery*—the holding in bondage, the buying and selling of human beings—is not only in the *abstract*, but in all and under every circumstance, a sin in the sight of heaven, a violation of the spirit of the Gospel, and an infringement on the inalienable rights of man; that as a sin, men should be faithfully warned of its nature—should repent, and immediately forsake it.”

The Holland Purchase N. Y. Baptist Association say—

“That Slavery, as it exists in these United States, is a *national sin*—a hindrance to the spread of the Gospel and the extension of the Redeemer’s kingdom; and that it calls for the prayers and efforts of Christians to bring it to a speedy termination.”

The Protestant Methodist Conference of Vermont say—

“That, in the opinion of this Annual Conference, the practice of holding our fellow men in involuntary slavery is a sin, and ought to be abolished.”

The French Creek (Pa.) Baptist Association passed the following resolutions:—

“That we deem slavery a sin of most cruel and dangerous character, making war upon the rights of man and the laws of God.

“That, like all other sins, slavery ought to be immediately abandoned; that, like all other sins, it ought to be driven from the church; and that, like all other sins, the whole energies of the church should be concentrated for its extermination.

“That this Association refuse fellowship with slaveholding Baptist Associations, and advise all our churches to adopt rules excluding slaveholders from their communion tables.

The Presbytery of Indianapolis (Indiana) resolved as follows:—

“That this Presbytery will receive no minister as a member who is a slaveholder, or who has sold a slave or slaves into unconditional bondage, unless he will first make all the reparation that may still be in his power.

“That it be recommended to the church sessions under our care, not to receive any person into the communion of the church who is a slaveholder, or who has sold a slave or slaves into unconditional slavery, unless they will first make all the reparation that may be still in their power.”

The Stonington Union Baptist Association (Ct.) say, in regard to slavery,

"We will not insult the Almighty with the reply of the guilty Cain, "Am I my brother's keeper?" We feel rather to acknowledge before God, "we are verily guilty concerning our brother!" We are loudly called upon for these reasons to express our sentiments on this subject.

"The stand taken by Christians at the South, in attempting to justify their guilty course by the Word of God, would make us partakers of their sins were we to remain silent. Duty calls upon us to record our names against this perversion of the Holy Scriptures."

The Reformed Presbyterian church resolved upon and carried into effect the exclusion of slaveholders from its communion, as early as the year 1800. In 1828, this church gave its approbation to the Colonization Society, mistaking it for a means of removing slavery. At the last session of its General Synod in the city of Pittsburgh, it formally withdrew its approbation from the Colonization Society, and bestowed it unequivocally upon the Anti-Slavery Society. The following spirited and just sentiments are from the preamble and resolutions of this Synod:—

"We have always considered slavery to be an atrocious sin, an outrageous robbery of man from himself and from his Maker—as much more wicked than common robbery as liberty is more valuable than property. Surely, continuance in iniquity cannot make iniquity become justice—no legal investiture can make *wrong* to be *right*, neither can the sin of slavery justify the sin of banishing the sufferers; nor can we conceive of any thing more injudicious, than to transport the heathen of our land to evangelize them on the African shore. Therefore,
Resolved,

"1. That as this Synod has always borne explicit testimony against the heaven-daring sin of slavery, and lifted their warning voice against its awfully dangerous consequences, so they continue to do.

"2. That this Synod continues to maintain the duty and safety of the immediate and universal emancipation of the enslaved, and they view with satisfaction and interest the augmentation of numbers, and the increase of zeal among the friends of the abolition of slavery in our land.

"3. That the Colonization Society, in making expatriation a condition of emancipation—in fostering and not suppressing prejudice against the colored man—in extorting the consent of the enslaved to banishment, as if "by a *cart-whip*"—does not merit, but has forfeited the patronage of the Christian community, and cannot have the approbation of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.

"4. That however pure may be the motives of Colonizationists and benevolent their operations for the good of the colored man, an insuperable objection lies against the system, viz., that he never desired their aid in this way; the colored population of this country always shuddered at the idea of transportation to Africa, where the language of the people is to them barbarous, and the climate insalubrious. They have the innate attachment of mankind to the place of their nativity, and the peculiar horror of removal which is necessarily attached to those who have never read nor traveled; besides, it is plain, that some of them viewed from the first the plan of colonization with a suspicious eye, as designed to weaken the nature and remove the mind and muscles of free blacks, so that they could in no way minister to the removal of the heavy yoke that galled the shoulders of their brethren. In fine, they viewed, and still view more and more the transportation ship with horror, inferior only to the slave market; and the African shore with dread reluctance, only inferior to the rice plantation in Arkansas or Texas."

The Hancock (Baptist) Association, Maine, have resolved,

"That we, as the professed followers of Jesus Christ, have no fellowship or communion with those who, under the character of Christians, continue to hold their fellow men in bondage."

The Washington (Baptist) Association, Maine, passed the following :—

"That, as Christians, we can have no fellowship with those who, after being duly enlightened on this subject, still advocate and practice its abominations, and thus *defile* the church of God."

This is probably but a small part of the testimony of religious bodies to the *sin of slavery*, given without qualification or reserve. Let all the Northern churches come out in this spirit, throwing apologies and qualifications to the winds, and we shall soon see whether it will be considered a Christian thing, "*in itself considered*," to hold property in human flesh—to make men work without pay—to buy and sell the image of God!

It is one of the most auspicious signs in this Anti-Slavery movement, that it is not confined to any sect. It is as broad as human nature itself. Religious men of all sects feel that it comes home to their religious responsibilities, and that to keep silence now, when the oppressor is trampling in his fury, and the last hope of the slave seems fading into despair, is treason to God. From this rallying on common ground, in spite of the old thorny hedge fences of sectarianism, we infer that this cause has seized fast hold of religion itself, and not of its artificial drapery.

The effect of this moral attack upon slavery is beginning to be felt through the whole mass of the people. It shows itself already through some of our state legislatures. Where last year abolitionism was branded as treason, this year it has been openly avowed. Men who last year hoped to rise to power by abusing the Abolitionists, are this year humbly asking Abolition votes. Some have seen their mistake too late, and have been obliged to give place to better men.

No legislature of a free state has dared to comply with the insolent demand of the South, to suppress Anti-Slavery Societies by penal enactments.

In some, the rights of free speech and a free press have been nobly advocated. In the legislature of Pennsylvania, at the session before the last, the southern resolutions were referred to the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, of which the Hon. Thaddeus Stevens was chairman. The manly report of this committee holds the following language.

"The committee are compelled, by a sense of duty which they owe to Pennsylvania as a sovereign and independent state, and to themselves as freemen, to deny the right of Virginia, or any other state, to claim from us any legislation of the character referred to in these resolutions. Every citizen of the non-slaveholding states has a right freely to think and publish his thoughts on any subject of national or state policy. Nor can he be compelled to confine his remarks to such subjects as affect only the state in which he resides. Without regard to the place of his residence, he may attempt to show that the usury laws of New-York or Pennsylvania, or the laws regulating negro slavery in Virginia or Mississippi, are immoral and unjust, and injurious to the prosperity and happiness of the respective states; his arguments may be weak, foolish, and false, but it would be tyranny to prohibit their promulgation. Could any other state maintain the right to claim from us such legislation, we and our citizens would be reduced to a vassalage but little less degrading than that of the slaves whose condition we assert the right to discuss. Nor can we yield our assent to the opinion that Congress does not possess the right to abolish slavery within the district of Columbia and the territories of the United States. No such prohibition is to be found in the Constitution of the United States. But unrestricted right to legislate for them is expressly granted.

"Possessing such right, it would seem to be a reproach upon our national legislature not to have exercised it heretofore. Slavery not only exists within the district over which Congress has exclusive jurisdiction, but it is understood to be an extensive market for the sale of slaves. To witness droves of human beings bound together with iron fetters, and lashed forward to hopeless servitude, by freemen, decanting loudly and boastfully on the blessing of liberty, is a moral anomaly, which fails to shock only because of its familiarity.

"The committee forbear to notice those parts of the resolutions which seem to imply a menace, if the non-slaveholding states should not comply with the wishes of the slaveholding states on this subject, as it can hardly be believed that they were intended to bear such construction. The committee report the following resolutions:

"Resolved,—That the slaveholding states alone have the right to regulate and control domestic slavery within their limits.

"Resolved,—That Congress does possess the constitutional power, and it is expedient to abolish slavery and the slave trade within the District of Columbia."

This report was not adopted, but in the general sycophancy of the North, it is honorable to Pennsylvania, that it was introduced and advocated at all. It was a strong pulse of returning life.

Governor RITNER of the same state, took occasion in his annual message to reprimand in terms of just severity, "the base bowing of the knee to the dark spirit of slavery."—What could be more worthy to sink into the ears and hearts of freemen than his exhortation in the following words:

"While we admit and scrupulously respect the constitutional rights of other states, on this momentous subject, let us not by either fear or interest, be driven from aught of that spirit of independence and veneration for freedom which has ever characterized our beloved commonwealth.

"Above all, let us never yield up the right of free discussion of any evil which may arise in the land or any part of it; convinced that the moment we do so the bond of union is broken. For, the Union being a voluntary compact to continue together for certain specified purposes, the instant one portion of it succeeds in imposing terms, and dictating conditions upon another, not found in the contract, the relation between them changes, and that which was union becomes subjection."

The legislature of Vermont has done honor to her free mountains by the following resolutions, which were ordered to be transmitted to the executives of each of the states:—

Resolved,—By the general assembly of the State of Vermont, that neither Congress, nor the State Governments, have any constitutional right to abridge the free expression of opinions or the transmission of them through the medium of the public mails.

Resolved,—That Congress do possess the power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia.

The legislature of Massachusetts, called to speak for the right of petition, prostrated by the rules of the last Congress, has taken a position honorable to the state which abolished slavery by her Bill of Rights, and sustained it with a unanimity which has surprised the friends of humanity not less than it has cheered them.

Whereas, the House of Representatives of the United States, in the month of January, in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-seven, did adopt a resolution, whereby it was ordered that all petitions, memorials, resolutions, propositions, or papers relating in any way, or to any extent whatever, to the subject of slavery, or the abolition of slavery, without being either printed or referred, should be laid upon the table, and that no further action whatever should be had thereon; and whereas, such disposition of petitions then or thereafter to be received, is a virtual DENIAL OF THE RIGHT ITSELF; and whereas, by the resolution aforesaid, which is adopted as a standing rule of the present House of Representatives, the petitions of a large number of the people of this commonwealth, praying for the removal of A GREAT SOCIAL, MORAL AND POLITICAL EVIL, have been slighted and contemned; therefore,

Resolved,—That the resolution above named, is an assumption of power and authority, at variance with the spirit and intent of the Constitution of the United States, and injurious to the cause of freedom and free institutions; that it does violence to the *inherent, absolute, and inalienable rights of man*; and that it tends essentially to impair those fundamental principles of natural justice and natural law, which are antecedent to any written constitutions of government, independent of them all, and essential to the security of freedom in a State.

Resolved,—That our Senators and Representatives in Congress, in maintaining and advocating the full right of petition, *have entitled themselves to the cordial approbation of the people of this commonwealth*.

Resolved,—That Congress, having exclusive legislation in the District of Columbia, POSSESS THE RIGHT TO ABOLISH SLAVERY IN SAID DISTRICT, and that its exercise should only be restrained by a regard for the public good.

These resolutions, with their preamble, passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 378 to 16, and were concurred in by the Senate. That branch indeed went further, and voted UNANIMOUSLY to substitute for the last of the resolutions quoted above, the following:—

Resolved,—That Congress having exclusive legislation in the District of Columbia, possesses the right to abolish slavery and the slave trade therein; and the *early exercise* of such right is demanded by the enlightened sentiment of the civilized world, by the principles of the revolution and humanity.

The following additional resolution was adopted, Yeas, 33—Nays, 1.

Resolved,—That slavery being an admitted moral and political evil, whose continuance, wherever it exists, is vindicated mainly on the ground of necessity, it should be circumscribed within the limits of the states where it has already been established; and that no new state should hereafter be admitted into the Union, whose constitution of government shall sanction or permit the existence of domestic slavery."

These resolutions were finally receded from by the Senate, not because they had any disposition to retreat from the principles laid down in them, but to preserve a greater majority in the House.

A decision has been given by the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, whereby every slave brought by his master upon her soil, becomes free. The praise given to Massachusetts for this decision will sound almost as strangely hereafter, as the blame. No state that sincerely desires her soil to be free, can suffer any person to use the services of slaves upon it, and surely not a citizen of another state any more than one of her own. If a citizen of Louisiana may bring a troop of slaves at his heels, to be used as chattels or carried off as such, slavery is effectually reinstated in Massachusetts. Her own citizens have only to go to the great southern shambles and buy as much human flesh as they please. They may bring it home with them and use it as it is used in South Carolina. If there are any who think the citizens of Massachusetts so strong in virtue that she might safely have had the 'comity' to allow slaveholders commorant in her territory to enjoy the comfort of having their shoes untied and their coats unbuttoned by their own peculiar "property," let them remember that multitudes of the citizens of Massachusetts resort to the South to obtain wealth which is to be expended in their native state, and in their sojourn among slaveholders learn their ways. The case in question illustrates this remark. The girl Med, who was declared free by the Supreme Court, had been brought from New Orleans, by a Mrs. Slater, who came to reside with *her father*, Mr. Thomas Aves, in *Boston*. If the law had allowed this in one case, it might have done so in ten thousand. *Slaves* would soon form a prominent part of the fortunes brought back from New Orleans. The only wonder is, that Massachusetts should so long have neglected to defend herself from this inlet of slavery. The decision was, in

fact, the only means she had of preventing her own citizens from re-establishing slavery in her own territories.

While this action at the North assures us that we have not been laboring in vain to effect a change of public opinion here, there is not wanting a bow of hope even on the black cloud of the southern horizon. The tone of the South is lower. The slaveholding legislatures demanded of the free, that they should suppress abolitionism by penal enactments, which the free have refused to do. The earth is not moved from its course—the land does not bristle with steel nor flow with blood. The free states hold their place upon the map, and there is less prospect of a “Southern Convention” than ever. Every day is making abolitionism better understood at the South, and while some, the more they know of it are the more exasperated, others, and their number is not small, are conscience-smitten, and secretly pray that the cause of right may succeed. When it is remembered that slavery imposes upon all the whites at the South the most absolute and every-where-present despotism, that even individual slaveholders themselves are gagged by the inexorable system of which any one of them is but an infinitesimal part, it will not be wondered that southern abolitionism is secret and silent. Still it gives unquestionable signs of its existence. The very fear expressed by determined slaveholders would be proof enough of itself. When they represent themselves as reposing upon a magazine of gunpowder, it is at the doctrine of immediate emancipation in the midst of them that they are frightened, and not at the danger of slave insurrection, which long familiarity has taught them in a great measure to despise. But with all their effort to convince the northern people that they are *one* on the subject of slavery, the fact leaks out that abolitionism is taking root among them.

The North Carolina Watchman, printed at Salisbury, says,

“It (the Abolition Party,) is the growing party at the North, we are inclined to believe that there is even MORE OF IT AT THE SOUTH THAN PRUDENCE WILL PERMIT TO BE OPENLY AVOWED: if ever this faction become the majority, of which there is great danger, &c.”

Says a gentleman in a slave state, writing to the editor of the Philanthropist, “I am pleased with the onward movement of Anti-Slavery principles.” A minister of the Gospel in Kentucky, writing to the same editor, says, that his neighbors “have no sympathy with the indignation generally

expressed at the South against the abolitionists," but on the other hand, consider the South "as *infatuated* to the highest degree." They also begin to express more horror at "the traffic in slaves by ministers of the Gospel," and have some scruples against hearing them preach.

The following testimonials have also been received by the editor of the *Philanthropist*, to the estimation in which his paper is held in the midst of slavery :

April 30, 1836.

"So far as the general principles of immediate abolition are developed here, so far opposition to them, as principles, ceases : and much of that heat manifested on the first appearance of the *Philanthropist* has cooled. Your course is generally approved, and your friends here trust and believe that as you have begun, so you will continue, mild, calm, Christian like—YET COOL, firm, and unmoved."

From another in a Slave State, April 18, 1836.

"Your paper is regularly distributed here, and as yet works no *incendiary* results ; and, indeed, so far as I can see, general satisfaction is here expressed, both as to the temper and spirit of the paper, and no disapprobation as to the results."

A gentleman in Kentucky wrote to Gerrit Smith, Esq. under date of August 31, 1836.

"I am fully persuaded, that the voice of the free states, lifted up in a proper manner, against the evil, will awaken them from their midnight slumbers, and produce a happy change."

The *Maryville Intelligencer*, a newspaper in Tennessee, says,

"Through the urgent solicitations of an esteemed friend, we have concluded to commence the publication, in our next paper, of "The Report of the Synod of Kentucky, proposing a plan for the moral and religious instruction of their slaves." It is an able document, and but for its length, and one or two occasional aberrations, from what we consider a fearless defence of the *rights of man*, we should not have hesitated to have given it a place in our columns some time ago."

The "Report" referred to, so far as the full exposure of the wickedness of slaveholding is concerned, is a thoroughly abolition document. It flinches from a "fearless defence of the rights of man," only in allowing that the slaveholder may be innocent when he holds the legal relation of master for the slave's good. This republication, we must remember, is after a law making it penal in Tennessee to receive any Anti-Slavery paper or pamphlet. Yes, making it a penitentiary offence to receive this very Report of the Kentucky Synod.

Even in the city of Charleston itself, where more than one thousand human beings are sometimes advertised to be sold at auction, in a single newspaper, the Common Council has had under consideration a proposal for "the establish-

ment of a mart for the sale of negroes, in a place *more remote from observation*, and less offensive to the public eye, than the one now used for that purpose."

At the session of the New-York Annual Conference, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in June, last year, exceptions were made by a prominent member to the ministerial character of the Rev. S. C. D. for reading and showing an abolition paper to some of his parishioners. During the examination, there was present a southern travelling preacher, a resident of a slaveholding state.

When the Conference adjourned, he came to the minister whose conduct was censured, and addressed him as follows :

"Don't give it up—don't bow down to slavery. You have thousands at the South who are secretly praying for you; they get some of your publications, and they are converted by them. The Abolitionists have not misrepresented things; they have not yet told half the abominations of slavery."

A gentleman present who was struck with this avowal, took occasion to make particular inquiries of this southern minister, and he confirmed the following statements :

"1. That the South is not that unit of which the pro-slavery party boast. There is a diversity of opinion among them in reference to slavery; and that it is only Lynchism, or the reign of terror, which suppresses an expression of their opinions.

"2. That there are thousands who believe slaveholding sinful, particularly among the less opulent part of the community—that these were secretly wishing the abolitionists success, and did believe that God would bless the present movements to destroy slavery.

"3. That in despite of some northern postmasters and southern mail violators, Anti-Slavery publications find their way to the South—are read, and make converts. Hence the anticipations of Duff Green are verified, who was more afraid that the abolitionists would convert the southern master, than that they would incite the slave to insurrection. And,

"4. That those ministers of the Gospel and ecclesiastical bodies who indiscriminately denounce the abolitionists, without doing any thing themselves to remove slavery, have not the thanks of thousands at the South—but, on the contrary, are viewed as taking sides with slaveholders, and recreant to the principles of their own profession."—*Zion's Watchman*.

Testimony of this kind might be extended through many pages, and however apocryphal some may please to consider it, to the spirits of those who have been toiling under the burden and heat of this cause, it has been as springs in the desert. But setting the testimony aside, ought any man, on the ground of human nature itself, to doubt the existence of such feelings at the South? An entire community can hardly be made to harmonize in any system or theory, right or wrong, much less can full concurrence be secured to a system of practical oppression. Never was the enginery of

self-interest set in fuller motion than to secure "unity of faith" under the Roman Pontiffs of a few centuries ago.—How few and faint and hopeless the sparks of free thought, that no sooner appeared above the surface, than they were drowned in an ocean of omnipresent despotism! Hear the universal acclaim of Europe, like the waves of the sea, shouting Hosanna to the Pope? Who would have thought that the tremendous power of that system, binding every man, from the throne to the dunghill, with the three-fold cord of superstition, lucre and lust could be broken. Who would have thought that there slumbered under that sea of corruption a moral energy which would one day make the spiritual Autocrat content to retain the shadow of his power? Yet such an energy there was, which when kindled to action, like the gunpowder in the granite rock, was the more efficient from the firmness of the barriers which enclosed it. Just so, there is mind at work, under the iron rule of the slave system which no voice reveals, but which works the more powerfully for that. The more profound the silence now, the louder the explosion by and by.

To these sources of hope, we may add the recent developments of a Providence which never establishes the throne that frames mischief by a law. The commercial world is now passing into one of those collapses which never fail to succeed an overblown system of credit. The scramble for wealth has probably been rendered more than usually ardent and headlong by the general peace which has existed since the last great man-tiger was caged at Waterloo. Men have not been contented to await the natural products of capital and industry; nor fairly to share with each other the results when they came. There has been a prodigious effort, by blowing up the system of *credit* on the one hand, to convert the products of the future into the wealth of the present, and on the other, to forestall and monopolize the wealth that is to be. There has been a general system of crediting to be credited, the men of real wealth little recking that in thus avariciously grasping for more, they have been bidding premiums for idleness and dishonesty. Among those who have seized these premiums with most avidity, and whose faithlessness is doing most to bring the whole system to its ruin, are the slaveholders. Since the genius of Arkwright took the distaff and the spindle from the hands of the busy housewife, and multiplying them by

hundreds, set them to whirling by the magic of steam, capitalists have had the means of clothing the whole world. The cheapest material is cotton, and unfortunately, the most available resource for that has been our slave-cursed Southern country, and especially since the *unpaid* ingenuity of Whitney opened the uplands to the culture of the staple which before could be raised profitably only on the most fertile plains and sea-islands. As the market for the goods, at the price at which machinery could manufacture them, was almost boundless, the demand for the raw material has steadily risen with the increase of machinery. Abating for the decrease of the value of money, consequent upon an exorbitant increase of banking, it is probable that the price of cotton has increased two-thirds during the last six years—nominally, it has more than doubled. Here, then, free labor being shut out from competition, a premium of untold wealth has been held out to the driving of slaves. Northern merchants, anxious to partake the rich plunder, have offered their aid to the whip-wielding power. They have furnished their capital for the extension of slave labor, and have been permitted to reap great profit from the carrying trade. Madly hastening to be richer, they have outbid each other in long credits, to secure Southern custom, till the South, like all well-trusted and prodigal customers, has squandered her own means and theirs, and they are left in the lurch. The lavish expenditure of the South, like that of Spain enriched by the gold of Mexico and Peru, always outruns its vast resources; so that, supposing the price of cotton had gone on increasing, the South would sooner or later have failed to pay her immense debts. For the last few years, she has striven to help her failing fortunes by the necromancy of banking, and has thus set her slave system into the most feverish and fearful activity. In the State of Mississippi alone, the bank circulation is said to be not less than \$60,000,000, while the paid capital is but \$10,000,000, and the specie but \$2,000,000. With this vast inflation of money, it is no wonder that the price of a working slave has risen to \$1500—more than double what it was when slave-growing Virginia professed to have serious thoughts of emancipation. But with all this abundance of money, the State is mortgaged to Northern merchants, who have advanced for crops that are yet to be planted. The same state of things exists, in a greater or less degree,

through the whole cotton-growing South. The price of cotton, had it kept up, could not have borne the enormous extravagance and mad speculation that have grown out of the slave system. There must be a re-action upon the system itself. Both the cotton-growers and the slave-growers will soon be brought to feel—but with tenfold pressure—what Virginia felt in 1832. No scale of profit can permanently enrich a slaveholding country.

The natural result of this extraordinary bankruptcy at the South, would be to throw the ownership of large numbers of slaves upon Northern capitalists—in which case, there is reason to believe, they would derive less profit from them than they do now. But another event is perhaps more likely to happen. Slavery is the rule of violence and arbitrary will, and not of reason or law. It would be quite in character both with its theory and practice, as exhibited at the South, if the slave-drivers should refuse to pay their debts, and meet the sheriff with dirk and pistol. In a country where hanging without trial is justified by the highest authority—the body of the people—it is hardly to be expected that the sacredness of contracts can be very deeply felt. Should Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas, subject the claims of our merchants to their favorite “Lynch law,” it will have the good effect, at least, to cool their ardor in the defence of “the peculiar institutions of the South.”

But there is another cause, besides the enormous prodigality of slaveholders and the ebb-tide of commercial credit, which begins to operate to lessen the profits of slave-labor: and, if we mistake not, it will continue to diminish the price of cotton after the present difficulty of trade shall have passed away. The British have possession of a country on the other side of the globe, containing 100,000,000 of people, with a soil and climate, to say the least, as well adapted to the growth of cotton as ours, and the cheapest labor in the world. Till recently, the commerce of that country has labored under the crushing incubus of the East India Company—a monopoly which, though invaded in 1814, was not prostrated till the 22d of April, 1834. Since the latter date, the trade with India has been perfectly free; and, as a consequence, British capital is now beginning to rush to the banks of the Indus and the Ganges, and to produce its usual effects. Already has the intercourse with

that country so much increased, that travel is seeking a shorter cut than the stormy Cape of Good Hope; and it is highly probable, that another year will see regular "steamers" on the Euphrates. Already have the resources of India begun to be developed in the exportation of cotton. In the year 1836, Great Britain received from India nearly as much cotton as is manufactured in the United States, being about one-fifth part of her whole consumption, and an increase of 100,000 bales upon the previous year.* And the

* The following is the statement published in the English papers, at the commencement of the present year:—

"Statement of the General Import and Export of Cotton into and from the whole kingdom, from the 1st of January to the 31st ult., and of the Imports and Exports for the same period last year.

IMPORTS IN 1836.

American	- - - - -	bags	764,636
South American	- - - - -		147,961
West Indies, Demerara, &c.	- - - - -		36,569
East Indies	- - - - -		219,244
Egypt, &c.	- - - - -		32,421

TOTAL, of all descriptions - - - 1,200,531

IN 1835.

American	- - - - -	bags	751,399
South American	- - - - -		151,017
West Indies, Demarara, &c.	- - - - -		7,705
East Indies	- - - - -		111,622
Egypt, &c.	- - - - -		41,816

1,066,162

Increase of imports, as compared with 1835 - - - 110,042

EXPORTS IN 1836.

American, 23,800; Brazil, 2,300; East India, 81,400; West India, 1,100, other kinds, 20.

Total in 1836	- - - - -	bags	108,000
Same period in 1835	- - - - -		102,100

STOCK.

December 31, 1836	- - - - -	bags	289,000
Same time, 1835	- - - - -		230,013

A communication in the N. Y. Evening Post, from a responsible source, quotes a letter from a friend, dated "Bombay, the 29th July, 1835," in the following words:—

"As you have taken a good deal of interest in the Cotton cultivation of this country, you perhaps will like to hear that it is just now taking a wonderful start. The Deccan, Candeish, the Southern Mahratta country, and even Canara and Malabar, have become cotton countries, and are rivaling Guzerat in that respect. But the most remarkable circumstance is, that immense quantities of cotton have been brought within the past year or two to Bombay, from the sources of the Nerbudda, in the very centre of India, by a land carriage of 700 miles! The road from Poona to Bombay, is described as being completely blocked up with bullocks laden with cotton; and my informant tells me that he saw strings of them extending without a break for miles; and this in a country where a bale of cotton

importers in Liverpool caution their friends here, that the lower descriptions of American cotton will probably be interfered with by the increasing consumption of Surat cotton.* "The Stock remaining," they say, "is large, and next year's import will no doubt be abundant. This will insure to the spinners a constant supply, and induce them to adapt their machinery to this description of cotton, *unless a great reduction takes place in the price of low American.*" It seems obvious, that a demand for cotton made upon the rich soil and teeming population of India, must soon be met by an overwhelming supply; and when this supply is once established, it will bear a great reduction of price. And let it be remarked, that the great distance of the sea voyage will very little enhance the expense of transportation. That expense, at the most, is but trifling; and as India is becoming a great market for manufactured goods, cotton is needed for homeward freight. Who can doubt, that the culture of India by free British capital will soon bring the price of cotton so low, that it will no more bear the waste and slovenliness of slave labor, than corn and potatoes? Slave-grown cane sugar is threatened with a similar fate by the cultivation of the beet.

Rice and tobacco have long been rather sources of loss than of profit. The export of these products stands almost precisely where it did forty-five years ago. Indeed, it would seem that the cultivation of tobacco in Virginia and Maryland must long since have ceased, had it not been kept alive by the increasing profit of the "vigintial crop" of human beings. The quantity produced in free states has been enlarging, and the price falling. Last winter, a general convention of delegates from the tobacco planters of Ohio, Virginia, and Maryland, was held in Washington City, by which it was resolved to memorialize Congress to

was not even seen ten years ago! I am happy to say, too, that it is not only in quantity that we are improving. The European commercial houses here, of which there are no less than thirty now, are many of them agents of manufacturers in Manchester, and are fully alive to the importance of clean cotton. They have accordingly taken a good deal of pains to get it picked and packed in the best manner, and I do not doubt will eventually succeed in improving the quality of all the cotton brought to market. At present, it is calculated that the cotton of the Deccan may be cultivated for 90 rupees per candy, (700 lb.) equivalent to 5 1-2 cents per pound. It is, however, sellin' for 250 rupees, so that the stimulus to cultivation is enormous. It is indeed supposed, should the present process continue, that no less than 400,000 bales of cotton will be exported from India next year."

* Circular of Collman, Lambert, & Co., published in the Charleston Mercury.

go a-begging to the potentates of Germany, to take off the duties and restrictions whereby their "peasantry," to employ the language of the convention, "are compelled to use their inferior miserable stuff [what a pity!] at an exorbitant price, mixed with a small portion of American product." But it is doubtful whether those high powers will condescend, even at the humble entreaty of a slaveholding republic, to allow their liege subjects to poison themselves any cheaper or better than they do now. The value of the export of the last year was estimated by the convention at nearly \$9,000,000; on which, it is since learned, that a loss of 25 per cent, or more than \$2,000,000, has been experienced, by the fall of price. And, plainly, the *vile weed*, aided by all the governments and smokers in the world, can no longer give any effectual relief to the sinking cause of slavery—a cause not more at war with the eternal principles of justice and honesty, than it is with the equally eternal principles of arithmetic and political economy.

Let the slaveholders drive on, then, and add the Naboth's vineyard of Texas to the fertile territories taken by similar robbery from the shamefully-wronged Indians; yet a cause over which they *have no control* is destined to strip them of all their advantages, and make their tyranny as unprofitable as it is wicked.

These causes, it is true, will not of themselves abolish slavery, but they will bring slaveholders more within the reach of moral influence, and weaken the mainspring of their tyranny. They will put the wrong-doers in a state of mind to give heed to the truth and seriously consider the claims of justice. They will arouse that discussion at the South which was lately broken off in Virginia by the sudden factitious enhancement of the price of slaves. If there is any truth in the view we have taken, now is the time to rally the moral power of the world against the slave system—now when it reels under the recoil of its own mad attempts to enlarge its power.

The advantage afforded by the present commercial crisis will further appear as we consider the obstacles which have opposed the accomplishment of our designs, or rather which rendered it necessary to resort to such an organization as the American Anti-Slavery Society.

The desire to get the most riches for the least labor is not peculiar to slaveholders. It has been common among men since the curse pronounced upon our first father. It is to

this feeling that all dishonest men appeal for support, and when the mass suppose they have more to gain than to lose by their dishonesty the appeal is too often successful. It has been so with the masters of slaves. They have interwoven their interests with those of others. They have found it necessary to admit others to a share of the plunder, for the purpose of securing the rest.

The labor of two and a half millions of people upon a bountiful soil, though ill directed, must yield, beyond their bare support in working condition, an immense amount of wealth. If it were suffered to accumulate, it would soon cover the land with palaces. But instead of any thing like this, our southern country gives every indication that the wealth of the soil is prodigally dissipated as fast as it is produced. And it is in fact the common plunder of the country. The whole white race at the South participate in it. Northern merchants, northern mechanics, and manufacturers, northern editors, publishers, and printers, northern hotels, stages, steamboats, rail-roads, canal boats, northern banks, northern schoolmasters, northern artists, northern colleges, and northern ministers of the Gospel, all get their share of emolument from this general robbery of the poor. It is true enough that a much larger amount of wealth might be derived from the fertile plains of the South by a system of free labor, but it could not be obtained without more exertion on the part of all who are to enjoy it. When men have earned their money by their own labor they are sparing in the use of it, and do not like to part with it but for a full equivalent. But when they have obtained it at the expense of others they spend it liberally. Hence, there is a "generosity" in the patronage of slaveholders which we do not find in the patronage of even richer men whose wealth is the fruit of their own industry. It is this free hand which endears them to most who go among them or have any dealings with them. Multitudes who imagine themselves opposed to slavery lose their hearts through their pockets, at the first contact with Southern men. They would indignantly repel the insinuation that they had been corrupted through their interests or had ceased to be opposed to slavery. And perhaps it is not exactly true that they have been *bought* to support slavery, or that they are less opposed to it than they ever were. But they have seen slaveholders and know that they are honorable customers and generous friends—they believe they have their peculiar rea-

sons for what they do—and they know that it is hopeless to interfere. They imagine themselves as much the friends of the slave as ever, and they certainly see much more to admire in the master. They are persuaded that it is worse than useless to do any thing for the abolition of slavery which does not set out with the consent of the master. They are sure that all they ever get or expect to get of the gains of slavery would not tempt them to continue the system if it were in their power to abolish it. And thus they convince themselves that their part in the great robbery has not made them either the enemies of the slave or of the abolitionist. But it has certainly made them the friends of the slavenholder. They admire the slaveholder and shield him from the denunciations of the abolitionists, because there is nothing sordid in him, but every thing noble, generous and friendly—all of which means that he has given freely to themselves or their friends in one way or another. Now let us count the men who have direct intercourse with the South, and then take into the account the circles of their northern friends—each intersecting or touching other circles, and we shall find at last that there is not an individual in the whole country whose opinion is not in a greater or less degree acted upon by an influence which was set in motion by a southern bribe. Whole masses of men are thus pulling in the harness of the slaveholders with laborious zeal, while they would have us believe that they are enemies of slavery. They may be unconscious of their friendship for it, but it is none the less real for that.

We might crowd pages with facts illustrating the importance which slaveholders attach to northern support, and the confidence they have in the tie of pecuniary interest, as well as the base servility practised by northern men without a blush, as if it were but the manifestation of honorable friendship or Christian charity. But it would be wasted room. These facts are too common to excite surprise. The idol of slavery has been set up and the burning wrath of the South has been proclaimed as the penalty for refusing to fall down and worship. Not only have the venders of dry goods and groceries, been obliged to disclaim abolition, but the Pharaoh of the South has laid his injunctions upon that profession whose honorable business it is to bring into the world the creations of thought, and has commanded them as did the Egyptian King their prototypes of old, to strangle at the birth

every thing that bears the manly tokens of a love for human liberty. And alas, that we must say it, our literary accoucheurs, unlike those noble Hebrew women, have not feared God and disobeyed the king! We must be allowed to give one or two specimens of the servility to which we refer, which will show as well as a thousand, how by sheer bribery, slavery is corrupting all that is noble in moral feeling, and prostrating all that is honorable in national character. The cases we select from the multitude are not peculiar. Nor have we any private resentment to gratify in bringing them forward. Some objections were made in the *Columbia (S. C.) Telescope*, to the Narrative of Messrs. Reed and Matheson, as containing incendiary matter. As soon as the eyes of the publishers, Harper and Brothers of this city, fell on these remarks, they immediately wrote to the editor of the *Telescope*, excusing themselves on the ground that they were not able to read every book they published, and did not suspect any thing improper. Most humbly do they endeavor to persuade the slaveholders that they would not willingly publish any thing offensive to them, and close with the following words :

"You have no doubt heard of Mr. Abdy's book, which was represented to us as very ably written, and likely to be profitable; but we were told, also, that Mr. Abdy was an abolitionist, and we would have nothing to do with him. We are, very respectfully,

Your obedient servants,

HARPER & BROTHERS."

But obediently servile as they were, they were careless enough after this to publish the "Tales of the Woods and Fields" a romance, containing a whole chapter of "true abolition stuff." The southern "patriarchs" behaved as they are wont to do when an awkward slave upsets a dish of gravy. The Harpers, one of the largest, if not the very largest, publishing house in America, got down upon their knees still more humbly than before, and wrote the following penitential letter to a Charleston bookseller, which was published in the *Charleston Mercury*.

"Dear Sir,—We were entirely ignorant of the fact that the 'Woods and Fields' contained the objectionable matter referred to in your letter of the 2d inst. until after the work was published. The peculiar circumstances in which we were placed, rendered it necessary to issue the work in an unusually short time, and without a previous perusal. We regret the inadvertency very much. We trust, however, that our friends at the South are sufficiently well acquainted with our views and feelings, on the delicate subject in question, to attribute the circumstance to the right cause. By this time it must be pretty generally understood in

your section, as well as elsewhere, that we uniformly decline publishing works calculated to interfere in any way with southern rights and southern institutions. Our interests, not less than our opinions, would dictate this course, if there were no other less selfish considerations acting upon us. Since the receipt of your letter, we have printed an edition of the 'Woods and Fields,' in which the offensive matter has been omitted.

In haste,

Yours respectfully,

HARPER & BROTHERS."

"In haste!" Yes, what trembling slave ever made greater haste to obey the tyrant in whom was vested the ownership of both his soul and body? In one short month the fiat of expurgation travels from Charleston to New-York, the Harpers settle it with their consciences to expunge, mutilate, and falsify the work of a foreign author, and are prepared to say, that they have printed a new edition "*in which the offensive matter has been omitted.*" Here, for the sake of southern custom, is perpetrated a literary forgery, or we should rather say murder, which in a free country, where mind had its honors, should have brought on these publishers everlasting disgrace—yet they are "honorable men"—for they have stooped no lower than the mercantile community in which they move!

A similar outrage has been perpetrated upon the valuable historical and topographical work on the United States of the Rev. John Howard Hinton of England, republished in numbers under the editorial care of Samuel Knapp, Esq. The slaveholders were displeased with the faithful accuracy of their own portraits in one of the numbers and resorted to their usual redress in such cases. In New Orleans a large quantity of the numbers were seized and burnt, and the agent fled for his life. In Charleston another agent collected the copies of the obnoxious number and withdrew them. The publishers at the North took the hint, and prepared another edition, in which the offensive passage was omitted, and thus the Rev. Mr. Hinton was made, perforce, to observe a proper silence on the delicate subject.

It is perfectly immaterial whether we attribute to interest, or to friendship for the slaveholder, such instances of shameful sycophancy, which have become too common to bring reproach. Their bearing on the slave is the same in either case.

But great as is the influence of southern bribery, in the shape of custom, patronage, friendship and hospitality, there

is opposition that has been encountered, and is yet to be, which cannot be thus accounted for. There is an enmity to our principles which does not depend upon the price of cotton. Autocrats are not the only men who love power. The foundation for slavery is broadly laid in perverted human nature, and Mr. McDuffie is not the only man who holds that slavery in some form is one of the essential elements of society. There are men among us who have no fondness for the form of slavery that exists at the South, who are nevertheless deadly hostile to our doctrines in regard to human rights. They are the men who pay homage to wealth and power and place, whose respect and reverence for a man depends more upon the coat which he wears, than the heart which he carries within him. They do not freely accord to their fellow-men the right of thinking as they please on any subject. They are deeply jealous of free thought, and depend less upon reason and truth to combat what they consider error of opinion, than upon management and gagging. This class of men have, with much propriety, been denominated the aristocracy of the North. Aside from all motives of pecuniary interest, and all theories in regard to the justice or policy of the peculiar type of oppression existing at the South, they hold a set of opinions in perfect accordance with those of slaveholders. Their ethics are essentially slaveholding ethics. Their system of morals sacrifices not only private will, but private right, to what they please to call the public good. Abuses sanctioned by law become with them forever sacred. According to their republicanism the rights of the minority, (when they happen not to be in it) are held by the free grace of the majority. In ecclesiastical matters they are always "high-church"—conservatists of forms, powers, creeds, usages, rather than of the blessedly free and benevolent spirit of the Founder of christianity. They seem to fear the prevalence of abolition principles not so much from their hostile bearing upon southern slavery, as lest they should undermine their own power and influence. It is from these men, entrenched in offices of church and state, or wielding the power of old established presses that we have the bitterest opposition to expect.

The opposition during the past year from both the sources to which we have referred has been more active and virulent than ever. The newspaper presses have poured out

their torrents of abuse and falsehood. At one time they have represented abolitionism as dying away, just gasping for breath, and at another as wielding a tremendous power and commanding by means of enormous and secret wealth an agency which would soon dissolve the Union, and overturn the liberties of the country. Nor have they contented themselves with railing at the Anti-Slavery Societies, but the constituted authorities, when they have ventured to favor the doctrine of equal human rights, have come in for a share of abuse. The legislatures of Vermont and Massachusetts, the Governor of Pennsylvania, and the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, now have to bear the reproach of *fanaticism* to which *our* ears have become quite familiar. To illustrate the utter profligacy to which many of our leading presses have proceeded, we quote a paragraph from a column published in one of the papers of New-York, which boasts a circulation of 10,000 copies daily among "*the better part of the community.*" The subject of its abuse is the decision of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts against the right of any persons to introduce and hold slaves in that state. Says the distinguished editor :

"Under this decision, property in one state is not property in another, and any state may interdict its being brought into it, or take it away when there, from its lawful owner.

"The conscientious people, who live under the code Lynch, cannot but be marvellously comforted at seeing the decisions of their oracle thus sustained by the Chief Justice of the peaceable and orthodox state of Massachusetts. The code Lynch is founded on an utter disregard to the rights of person and property, the laws of the land, and the Constitution of the United States. The code Shaw rests on a basis similar in all respects to that of the code Lynch. Let us compare the two together, and the identity will be apparent."

Had an abolitionist placed the act of even an inferior officer of one of our courts on a level with the outrageous proceedings of a lawless mob, the welkin would have been made to ring with the outcry against him. But strange as it may seem, here is the respect paid by a large portion of the newspaper press to every man or body of men, high or low, who presume to advocate the doctrine of human liberty! The mischiefs of such presses are counteracted only by the very general conviction among their patrons that their veracity and honesty are always secondary to their interests.

But the most effective opposition we have met with has been from the professed ministers of Christ! The leading influences of the most extensive denominations of Chris-

tians, while they are making no effort whatever against the enormous crime of holding men as property, have spared no pains to thwart the purposes of others who are. Well aware of their influence on every subject pertaining to morals, they have used it to the utmost against the doctrines of equality of rights and immediate emancipation.

The general quadriennial Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which met last spring in Cincinnati, a body which in 1780 declared slavery to be contrary to the laws of God, man and nature—contrary to the dictates of conscience and pure religion, passed the following resolutions, the first by a vote of 122 to 11, and the second of 120 to 14.

*"Resolved, by the delegates of the annual conferences, in General Conference assembled, That they disapprove, in the most unqualified sense, the conduct of two members of the General Conference, who are reported to have lectured in this city recently upon and in favor of modern abolition.**

"Resolved, by the delegates of the annual conferences, in General Conference assembled, That they are decidedly opposed to modern abolitionism, and wholly disclaim any right, wish, or intention, to interfere in the civil and political relation between master and slave, as it exists in the slaveholding states of this Union."

It was with good reason that this Conference prefixed the epithet *modern* to the word abolitionism. The denomination was founded little more than half a century ago by men who were uncompromising abolitionists, and no sin was more pointedly excluded by its rules than slavery. To have expressed unqualifiedly their decided opposition to abolitionism, would have been to unchurch their own venerated Wesley. They were obliged therefore to pretend that the abolitionism of the Anti-Slavery Societies is different from that of their founder, a pretence which proves to be miserably hollow whenever the two sorts of abolitionism are placed side by side. The earliest Methodists rigidly excluded slaveholders from their churches; subsequently they were admitted but enjoined to free their slaves as soon as practicable, last spring it was stoutly claimed that the southern church ought to be allowed a *slaveholding bishop*, and a *secession* is threatened if this request is not granted by the next Conference.

The use which the Southern portion of the church claim to make of these resolutions is abundantly illustrated by

* In the debate on the floor of the Conference the Rev. Wm. A. Smith, of Virginia, allowed himself to say of the Rev. Orange Scott, of Massachusetts, "I would to God he were in heaven, where he is prepared to go." No retraction was required by the Conference.

the following extracts. First, we have a letter from George W. Langhorne, a methodist minister, to the editor of *Zion's Watchman*, dated Raleigh, N. C., June 25, 1836:—

"I, sir, would as soon be found in the ranks of a banditti, as numbered with Arthur Tappan and his wanton coadjutors. Nothing is more appalling to my feelings as a man, contrary to my principles as a Christian, and *repugnant* to my soul as a *minister*, than the insidious proceedings of such men.

"If you have not resigned your credentials, as a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, I really think that, as an *honest* man, you should now do it. In your ordination vows, you solemnly promised to be obedient to those who have the rule over you; and since they have spoken, and that *distinctly*, too, on this subject, and disapprove your conduct, I conceive that you are bound to submit to their authority, or *leave the church*."

Again, at a public meeting held at Orangeburgh, S. C., on the 21st of July, 1836, which had been called for the purposes of considering what should be done with a copy of *Zion's Watchman*, which had been sent to the Rev. J. C. Postell, a member of the South Carolina Conference of the Methodist E. Church, Mr. Postell read an address to the citizens of that place, which was published in the *Charleston Courier* of Aug. 5, 1836, and of which the following is an extract:—

"From what has been premised, the following conclusions result: 1. That slavery is a judicial visitation. 2. *That it is not a moral evil.* 3. *That it is supported by the Bible.* 4. It has existed in all ages.

"It is not a moral evil. The fact, that slavery is of DIVINE APPOINTMENT, would be proof enough with the Christian that it cannot be a moral evil. So far from being a moral evil, it is a MERCIFUL VISITATION—"IT IS THE LORD'S DOINGS, AND MARVELLOUS IN OUR EYES." And had it not been for the best, God alone, who is able, long since would have overruled it. IT IS BY DIVINE APPOINTMENT."

At the same meeting, the Rev. Mr. Postell read a letter which he had addressed to the editor of *Zion's Watchman*, of which the following are extracts:—

"TO LA ROY SUNDERLAND, *Editor of Zion's Watchman, New-York:*

"Did you calculate to misrepresent the Methodist Discipline, and say it supported abolitionism, when the General Conference, in their late resolutions, denounced it as a *libel on truth*? 'Oh, full of all subtlety, THOU CHILD OF THE DEVIL.' 'All liars,' saith the sacred volume, 'shall have their part in the lake of fire and brimstone.'

"I can only give one reason why you have not been indicted for a libel. The law says, the greater the truth, the greater the libel; and as your paper has no such ingredient, it is construed but a small matter. But if you desire to educate the slaves, I will tell you how to raise the money, without editing *Zion's Watchman*: you and old Arthur Tappan come out to the South this winter, and they will raise One Hundred Thousand Dollars for you—New Orleans of herself will be pledged for it. Desiring no further acquaintance with you, and never expecting to see you but once in time or in eternity, which is at Judgment, I subscribe myself the friend of the Bible, and the opposer of Abolitionism,

Orangeburgh, July 21, 1836.

J. C. POSTELL.

The New-York Conference actually proceeded so far, as to exact a pledge of its candidates for the ministry, that they would not agitate the subject of slavery. Unblush-

ingly, over the yet fresh graves of Wesley, Watson, and Clarke, did they record the following resolution, for the purpose of curtaining out of sight unutterable abominations :—

“Resolved, That although we would not condemn any man, or withhold our suffrages from him on account of his *opinions*, merely, in reference to the subject of Abolitionism, yet we are decidedly of opinion that none ought to be elected to the office of a deacon or elder in our church, unless he give a pledge to the Conference that he will refrain from agitating the church with discussions on the subject—and the more especially as the one promises “reverently to obey them to whom the charge and government over him is committed, following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions;” and the other with equal solemnity promises to “maintain and set forward, as much as lieth in him, quietness and peace, and love among all Christians, and especially among them that are or shall be committed to their charge.”

The General Conference, to which we have already alluded, had in its Pastoral Address exhorted all under its care to “abstain from all Abolition movements and associations, and to refrain from patronizing any of their publications;” but it was reserved for a Conference in a nominally free state to go further, and interdict all discussion on the subject! Though scarcely less than 70,000 members of this communion are themselves either groaning under the yoke of bondage, or enjoying a nominal freedom but little better than slavery—bought, and sold, and driven as brutes—denied the reading of the Scriptures, and the security of domestic relations—and, indeed, subjected to the most cruel and degrading despotism ever enforced by man; every candidate is required by this Conference, *for the quiet and peace of the church*, to *pledge* himself not to agitate her communion by “discussions on the subject.” He must not only refrain from Anti-Slavery Societies, but must shut his mouth to the wrongs and woes of tens of thousands of his own Methodist brethren! A stranger would be tempted to inquire, What body, but a band of robbers, could deprecate the agitation of such a subject?

The proceedings of the last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, *presided over by a slaveholder*, are too interesting and instructive not to be noticed at some length. The Assembly of the previous year had received numerous memorials and petitions, praying for the reprobation of slaveholding as a sin against God. These were referred to a Committee, to be reported on to the Assembly of 1836. The following is the report which was presented by a majority of that Committee, through the Rev. Dr. Miller, its chairman :—

"The Committee to whom were referred, by the last General Assembly, sundry memorials and other papers touching the subject of slavery, with directions to report thereon to the General Assembly of 1836, beg leave to report—

"That after the most mature deliberation which they have been able to bestow on the interesting and important subject referred to them, they would most respectfully recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the following preamble and resolutions, viz.:

"Whereas, the subject of slavery is inseparably connected with the laws of many of the States in this Union, with which it is by no means proper for an ecclesiastical judicatory to interfere, and involves many considerations in regard to which great diversity of opinion and intensity of feeling are known to exist in the churches represented in this Assembly. And whereas, there is every reason to believe that any action on the part of the Assembly, in reference to this subject, would tend to distract and divide our churches, and would, probably, in no wise promote the benefit of those whose welfare is immediately contemplated in the memorials in question. Therefore,

"1. *Resolved*, That it is not expedient for the Assembly to take any further order in relation to this subject.

"2. *Resolved*, That, as the notes which have been expunged from our public formularies, and which some of the memorials referred to the Committee request to have restored, were introduced irregularly—never had the sanction of the church—and therefore never possessed any authority—the General Assembly has no power, nor would they think it expedient, to assign them a place in the authorized standards of the church."

The pitiful weakness of this attempt to shuffle off the eternal obligations of justice and mercy, is on a level with its wickedness. Is the subject of slavery more closely connected with the laws of any of the states, than is the subject of distilling and lottery gambling with some of them? Is it more closely connected than it was in 1818, when the General Assembly declared "the voluntary enslaving of one part of the human race by another, a gross violation of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature," and "utterly inconsistent with the law of God, which requires us to love our neighbor as ourselves." But is it possible, that a teacher of theology in the nineteenth century, could maintain before a body of Christian ministers, that the license of an immorality by the civil government is a reason why a religious body should neither interdict it, nor express any opinion concerning it? Could the Rev. Dr. Miller, of Princeton, maintain a doctrine that would have forbidden the Presbyterian church to discipline her members for frequenting the "hells" that are licensed in New-Orleans? But there was a "diversity of opinion," and "an intensity of feeling" in the churches, in relation to slavery! We suppose the same was almost equally true, in regard to some points of theology. Was it considered a good reason why the Assembly should not investigate and decide upon the case of Rev. Albert Barnes? Again, says the report, action would distract the churches. Would not the argu-

ment apply as well to the case of Mr. Barnes? Would it not apply as well to any other case where there should be a diversity of opinion? Would it not, indeed, go far to prove the uselessness of the Assembly itself? for if that judicatory can act only where there is unanimity in the churches, it would almost seem that its action might be dispensed with. Finally, the last reason assigned why the Assembly should take no further order on the subject, is, that it would not benefit the slaves. 'This is an assumption of the very point which it was important for the Assembly to have investigated. But was it not the first duty of an ecclesiastical body, to settle the right and wrong of slaveholding itself; and if, after "mature deliberation," it had found it wrong to buy and sell men, and hold them as things, would it not be a very plain case, that the practice ought to be stopped—as soon, at least, as (according to the cant phrase) *it can be done safely*? And if the Assembly had caused such a cessation with regard to the members of the Presbyterian Church only—who doubtless hold hundreds of thousands of slaves—can it be denied that the benefit of the slaves would have been promoted? If it should be objected, that an injunction in favor of emancipation would have been disregarded—as indeed it was in 1818—it might well be asked in what predicament must that church be, which will persevere in the practice of an open immorality, in spite of the solemn decision of her own highest judicatory.

Such were the reasons excogitated by the mature deliberations of three of its most prominent ministers, why the Presbyterian church should not prevent her members from trafficking in the souls of their own Christian brethren—from exacting labor without pay—from tearing asunder parents and children, husbands and wives—and from robbing the poor of the bread of life! If they are worthy to call forth the most profound astonishment and regret, how much more the proceedings of the Assembly which followed!

It must be borne in mind, that the slaveholding representatives of the church came to the Assembly expecting some action on the subject, and determined, if possible, to make it favorable to slavery. The Southern Delegation met, to the number of 48, and the following is the published result of their proceedings:—

"Resolved, That if the Assembly shall undertake to exercise authority on the

subject of slavery, so as to make it an immorality, or shall in any way declare that Christians are criminal in holding slaves, that a declaration shall be presented by the Southern Delegation, declining their jurisdiction in the case, and our determination not to submit to such decision.

"*Resolved*, That a committee of five be appointed to draw up a declaration and protest, embodying the views of this meeting on this subject, to be presented to the Assembly, on the contingency indicated in the above resolution.

"Messrs. Graham, Armistead, McFarland, Payne, and Nesbit, were appointed said committee.

"The meeting adjourned, to meet at the call of the chairman.

G. T. SNOWDON, Secretary.

At an adjourned meeting of this ecclesiastical caucus, the following preamble and resolution were adopted to be presented to the Assembly, as a substitute for those of Dr. Miller:—

"Whereas, the subject of slavery is inseparably connected with the laws of many of the states of this Union, in which it exists under the sanction of said laws and of the Constitution of the United States; and whereas, slavery is recognized in both the Old and New Testaments as an existing relation, and is not condemned by the authority of God: therefore, *Resolved*,

"The General Assembly have no authority to assume or exercise jurisdiction, in regard to the existence of slavery."

Here then we see the state of things in which the men who preside over our highest theological schools, the mints of public opinion on religious and moral subjects, would leave in quiet peace, like the stagnant sea over the slime of Sodom, the Presbyterian Church! Here is one party who petition the Assembly that the solemn decisions against slavery, of former Assemblies, repeated frequently up to the year 1818, and which have remained a dead letter on their minutes, may now at length be revived and honestly made the practical law of the Church—that a practice which was denounced year after year as a violation of the laws of God, may, with other sins, be put under the ban of the church. Another party boldly claims that American slavery, so far from being a violation of the laws of God, is sanctioned (for if their word "recognized" has less meaning, it is not to their purpose,) by the Holy Scriptures. Here, on one side, are fifty delegates claiming slavery as authorized by the Bible, and, on the other, more than that number exclaiming against it as the greatest possible outrage upon the rights of God and man. Now mark the course of the northern governing influences of the church. They say, 'Hush this controversy, brethren: let us have peace—peace above all things,—peace, though millions are crushed under our oppression, and the wrath of the Almighty gathers its thunderbolts. Give no decision, utter not a word, smother your feelings on both sides, and let us proceed in peace and har-

mony—one united church as we always have been.’ Where is the honor paid by such men to human conscience, to human reason, to the human heart—to those glorious faculties which are the image of God in the soul of man? Where is their reverence for eternal, immutable truth? Where their regard for the unity of the Spirit, and the smiles of God? Where their love for holiness without which no man shall see God? On their whole conduct stood out in staring capitals, which the world has read, that they cared not a straw for any of these things in comparison with the dignity of their stations, and the glory of their generalship in a *great church*,—be its materials what they might. The subject was finally disposed of by the following preamble and resolution, substituted for Dr. Miller’s report :

“Inasmuch as the constitution of the Presbyterian church, in its preliminary and fundamental principles, declares that no church judicatory ought to pretend to make laws to bind the conscience in virtue of their own authority; and as the urgency of the business of the Assembly, and the shortness of the time during which they can continue in session, render it impossible to deliberate and decide judiciously on the subject of slavery in its relations to the church; therefore,

“*Resolved*, That this whole subject be indefinitely postponed.”

If further demonstration of the inexcusableness of slavery had been wanting, it would have been furnished to the full, in the utter confusion of thought which this vote shows to have fallen upon a majority of the Assembly, like the darkness of Egypt. After assigning as the first reason for indefinitely postponing the subject, that the Assembly was constitutionally forbidden to make laws to bind the conscience, the preamble proceeds to speak of the impossibility of *deliberation*. What! did the Assembly think that the expression of an opinion on the subject of slavery would violate the rights of conscience, and *yet* did they wish to deliberate upon it? So far as we can guess the import of this proceeding from the hieroglyphic phraseology which the Assembly saw fit to employ, it would read in plain English thus: You abolitionists ask us to pronounce slaveholding a sin; be it known to you, therefore, that whereas, by so doing we should “bind the conscience, in virtue of our own authority,” an outrage forbidden by the constitution of our church, and as we have not time to do it deliberately, therefore, *Resolved*, that the subject be indefinitely postponed! Too many reasons are sometimes worse than none.

But seriously, did the Assembly mean to say that they could have no higher authority than *their own*, for pro-

nouncing slavery a sin? Could they have no authority but their own, for the protection of the family relations which slavery violates? No authority but their own, to prevent their members from withholding the hire of the laborers that have reaped down their fields? No authority but their own, to protect their own members from being sold like brute beasts under the auctioneer's hammer? What! did a professedly religious body, a large majority of whose members were from the free northern states—a missionary, body which is sending the Gospel to the nations of the earth, dare to say it could not find within the lids of the Bible any authority against those heathenish laws which exclude that very Bible from two and a half millions of our countrymen? Shame. Let these modest unassuming ecclesiastics, who tremble lest they should bind the consciences of people *by their own authority*—(for want of time to do it deliberately)—go back to the records which they and their fathers put upon their minutes, in years when the price of slaves was less, and fewer Presbyterian elders and ministers were getting rich by cotton planting at the expense of the unrequited poor, than there were in 1836; and let them expunge those records as tyrannous usurpations of the rights of conscience! Conscience, that divine monitor, to which the Rev. Drs. Miller and Hoge paid so tender a regard as to counsel their brethren to smother its monitions, **FOR THE PEACE OF THE CHURCH!**

Let us turn to the doctrine rejected by the Assembly, because they had not time deliberately to bind the consciences of men by their own authority. It is contained in the resolution reported by the Rev. Messrs. Dickey and Beman, the minority of the Slavery Committee:

"1. *Resolved*, That the buying, selling, or holding of a human being as property, is in the sight of God a **HEINOUS SIN**, and ought to subject the doer of it to the censures of the church.

"2. That it is the duty of every one, and especially of every Christian, who may be involved in this sin, to free himself from its entanglement without delay.

"3. That it is the duty of every one, and especially of every Christian, in the meekness and firmness of the Gospel, to plead the cause of the poor and needy, by testifying against the principle and practice of slaveholding; and to use his best endeavors to deliver the church of God from the evil; and to bring about the emancipation of the slaves in these United States and throughout the world."

These resolutions, be it remembered, the General Assembly of 1836 set aside *for the peace of the church*, that is to say, because the church was too deeply involved in the sin to bear reproof. The testimony of the Rev. James Smylie,

a Presbyterian minister in Mississippi, and for some twenty years the stated clerk of a Presbytery, in his pamphlet in defence of slavery, shows us to what degree the christians of the South make merchandise of men :

"If slavery be a sin, and ifadvertising and apprehending slaves with a view to restore them to their masters, is a direct violation of the divine law, and if *the buying, selling, or holding a slave, FOR THE SAKE OF GAIN*, is a heinous sin and scandal, then verily, *THREE-FOURTHS OF ALL THE EPISCOPALIANS, METHODISTS, BAPTISTS, AND PRESBYTERIANS, IN ELEVEN STATES OF THE UNION*, are of the Devil. They 'hold,' if they do not buy and sell slaves : and, *with few exceptions*, they hesitate not to 'apprehend and restore' runaway slaves, when in their power."

This fact, let it be observed, is introduced by the Rev. Mr. Smylie, as an argument to show that holding slaves *for gain*, is not a sin ! It cannot be a sin because *three-fourths* of southern christians are in the constant practice of it ! Thus we see that the christians of the South do not take up the shield, kindly furnished them by some of their apologists at the North, they do not pretend not to hold slaves for "selfish ends." They fully bear out the arrogant claim of Governor McDuffie that man-merchandise is a divine institution. To illustrate this further we will give at length the preamble and resolutions of the Harmony Presbytery of South Carolina, passed "unanimously :"

"Whereas, sundry persons in Scotland and England, and others in the North, East, and West of our country, have denounced slavery as obnoxious to the laws of God ; some of whom have presented before the General Assembly of our church, and the Congress of the nation, memorials and petitions, with the avowed object of bringing into disgrace slaveholders, and abolishing the relation of master and slave.

"And whereas, from the said proceedings, and the statements, reasonings, and circumstances connected therewith, it is most manifest that those persons "know not what they say nor whereof they affirm ;" and with this ignorance discover a spirit of self-righteousness and exclusive sanctity, while they indulge in the most reckless denunciations of their neighbor, as false in fact as they are opposed to the spirit and dictates of our holy religion-

"Therefore, *Resolved*,

"1. That as the kingdom of our Lord is not of this world, his church as such has no right to abolish, alter or affect any institution or ordinance of men political and civil merely : nor has the church even in our midst the right to prescribe rules and dictate principles which can bind or affect the conscience with reference to slavery, and any such attempt would constitute ecclesiastical tyranny. Much less has any other church or churches, or bodies of men, ecclesiastical, civil, or political under heaven, any the slightest right to interfere in the premises.

"2. That slavery has existed from the days of those good old slaveholders and patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, (who are now in the kingdom of heaven,) to the time when the apostle Paul sent a runaway slave home to his master Philémon, and wrote a Christian and fraternal epistle to this slaveholder, which we find still stands in the canons of the Scriptures ; and that slavery has existed ever since the days of the apostle and does now exist.

"3. That as the relative duties of master and slave are taught in the Scriptures, in the same manner as those of parent and child, and husband and wife, the existence of slavery itself is not opposed to the will of God ; and whosoever has a conscience too tender to recognize this relation as lawful, is 'righteous over much,' is 'wise above what is written,' and has submited his neck to the yoke

of man, sacrificed his Christian liberty of conscience, and leaves the infallible word of God for the fancies and doctrines of men.

"4. That the relation of master and slave is purely a civil relation, and in this state no person or persons can impair, abridge, or alter that institution, save the legislature or the people of South Carolina only."

We have not a right to conclude, however, from the unanimity with which these and multitudes of similar resolutions have been passed throughout the South, that they express the real opinions of the southern churches, or that the good leaven of abolitionism has not done already a mighty work upon southern conscience. Christianity is so plainly hostile to slavery, in its doctrines and precepts, that the mass of slaveholders are prone to suspect the southern churches of giving countenance to the abolitionists, and hence have addressed to them powerful motives to commit themselves in favor of slavery. It has been in a great degree, doubtless, under the influence of threats that members of churches, and especially ministers, have become slaveholders. In the last General Methodist Conference the Rev. Dr. Capers, of South Carolina, in mentioning the reasons why, after a certain date, the Methodists became less *odious* to the people of the southern states, said, "at length people began to consider that many of them were *slaveholders*—why should they be insurrectionists?" Southern christianity is itself enslaved, and its voice is not the voice of a free agent. To give a sample of the influence under which southern christians, so called, have always acted and which has at length assumed a most peremptory tone, we quote the proceedings of "a public meeting of the inhabitants of Clinton, Mississippi," held *prior* to the last sessions of the General Assembly and General Conference :

"Slavery through the South and West, is not felt as an evil, moral or political, but it is recognized in reference to the *actual*, and not to any Utopian condition of our slaves, as a BLESSING BOTH TO MASTER AND SLAVE.

"*Resolved*, That it is our decided opinion, that any individual who dares to circulate, with a view to effectuate the designs of the abolitionists, any of the incendiary tracts or newspapers now in a course of transmission to this country, is justly worthy, in the sight of God and man, of IMMEDIATE DEATH; and we doubt not, that *such would be the punishment of any such offender in any part of the state of Mississippi, where he may be found!*

"*Resolved*, That we recommend to the citizens of Mississippi to ENCOURAGE THE CAUSE OF THE AMERICAN COLONIZATION SOCIETY, so long as in good faith it concentrates its energies alone to the removal of the free people of color out of the United States.

"*Resolved*, That the CLERGY of the state of Mississippi be hereby recommended at once to take a stand upon this subject, and that their *further* silence in relation thereto, at this crisis, will, in our opinion, be subject to *serious censure*."

The South has given too many proofs of her readiness to

put such threats in execution to permit them to pass unheeded by those who already loved the sin of slavery more than they feared their consciences or their God.

But that we may more clearly see the malign influences we have to encounter, let us turn to a denomination of christians not directly connected with the South—a denomination which claims to stand foremost in benevolent enterprises for the benefit of the human race, and foremost in the liberty of the Gospel, the Congregationalists of Connecticut. The very mountains of that noble land frown upon tyranny. And those best acquainted with its well-schooled population are inclined to think them the most difficult subjects for quack management, either political or ecclesiastical. Yet, much as we are ashamed to do it, we must declare our conviction that the General Association of Connecticut, in its efforts to bar out the doctrines of our society from its precincts, has shown an adroitness of ecclesiastical tactics which may well recommend it to the holy see of the indivisible, infallible church. That body, containing within it many of the leading lights of New-England theology—men who have committed themselves, and drawn no small glory therefrom, to the scheme of African Colonization, and whose immortality seems wrapped up with the immortality of prejudice and oppression—saw with alarm the change which the doctrines of immediate emancipation were working in public, and especially in New-England opinion. The reasons of this judgment are to be found in the contrast between the Association's course on the subject of slavery, and that which honorable and ingenuous minds must have pursued.

First, the following preamble and resolutions were passed :

"Whereas the system of slavery, as defined and sustained by the laws of these United States, is contrary to the principles of the Gospel :

"And whereas the ministers and members of our churches are frequently emigrating to the slaveholding states, and whereas they are there strongly tempted to engage in the traffic in slaves, and to become upholders of the system of slavery ; Therefore,

"Resolved, That in the judgment of this Association, the buying and selling of human beings for selfish ends, by the ministers and members of our churches removing to the South, is a great sin, and utterly inconsistent with their Christian profession."

Till awed into the true "patriarchal" cant by the terrors of Lynch Law, a presbytery full of actual slaveholders might have passed just such resolutions, without a thought of ceasing from the robbery of the poor. They could easily purchase the reputation of sanctity by their professions

against selfishness, while they persuaded themselves that their own slaveholding was altogether benevolent. The General Association of Connecticut are too well acquainted with the proceedings of "the ministers and members of their own churches, emigrating to the slaveholding states," not to know that they generally become slaveholders by persuading themselves to buy slaves for a *benevolent purpose*. The resolution of the Association strongly implies that they may righteously do so; hence, while it was adapted to make the impression upon the people, that the Association was as much opposed to slavery as the Anti-Slavery Society, and therefore needed no lecturing from that society, it served also to put a plea in the mouths of northern slaveholders. It was ingeniously adapted to get popularity on both sides. Well aware that the conduct of northern ministers and church members who go to the South and become slaveholders, would have to stand the artillery of an Anti-Slavery public sentiment, the Association thought it good policy itself to seize the guns, and load them with bullets of cork. The reason of this severe accusation we think will appear, by attending to the fact that it was just about to adopt a resolution designed to exclude Anti-Slavery lecturers from the facilities commonly afforded by the churches to every important discussion of a moral topic. We say, designed to exclude: no one must look, however, for a formal display of arbitrary power, but rather for a cautious and guarded putting forth of well-husbanded ecclesiastical influence. That every reader may see the discreet mixing together of all the sources of popular odium, and the well-qualified generalities by which their real purpose was concealed, we give the whole series of resolutions which followed immediately after those above quoted:—

"1. *Resolved*, That while this General Association appreciate and would maintain, at all hazards, the unrestricted liberty of speech and the press, and while they fully recognize their own and every man's duty to prove all things, and their own and every man's responsibility to God, in relation to the reception of the truth, they do not admit an obligation upon the community to hear or read all that associations or individuals may volunteer to speak or print, or an obligation on the pastors of the churches to admit into their pulpits all the preachers or speakers who may desire to address the people, or in any other way, directly or indirectly, to facilitate the promulgation in the community of sentiments which are in their view of an erroneous or questionable character.

"2. *Resolved*, That the operations of itinerant agents and lecturers, attempting to enlighten the churches in respect to particular points of Christian doctrine and of Christian morals, and to control the religious sentiment of the community on topics which fall most appropriately within the sphere of pastoral instruction, and of pastoral discretion as to time and manner, *without the advice and consent*

of the pastors and regular ecclesiastical bodies, is an unauthorized interference with the rights, duties, and discretion of the stated ministry, dangerous to the influence of the pastoral office, and fatal to the peace and good order of the churches.

"3. *Resolved*, That the existence in the churches of an order of itinerating evangelists, devoted especially to the business of excitement, and to the promotion of revivals, cannot be reconciled with the respect and influence which are indispensable to the usefulness and stability of the stated ministry, to the harmony of ecclesiastical action in the churches, and to the steady and accumulating influence of the gospel and its institutions, and to purity in doctrine and discretion in action.

"4. *Resolved*, That regarding the present as a critical period in relation to the peace, purity, and liberty of our churches, and the efficiency of the pastoral office, we do recommend to our ministers and churches to discountenance such innovations as have been referred to in these resolutions, and we consider ourselves bound to sustain each other and the churches, in standing against all these invasions on our ecclesiastical order."

It is important to expend a little time and patience to unravel the sophistry and mischief of these famous resolutions; as they develope, to those who have eyes to see, the mode in which some great and wise men of our day hope to put down all opinions which happen to conflict with their own. It was highly politic to introduce a hush-law with a flourish about liberty of speech and the press. After that, we have a denial of the obligation of the community to hear every thing. Who ever claimed such an obligation? Nobody. Yet the authors of the first resolution put forth this generality as a soft pillow for those churches and ministers who have refused to hear what they were in conscience bound to hear. Because a minister is not under obligation to open his pulpit for the convenience of a play-actor or a preacher of paganism, it is left to be inferred that he may righteously shut from it every applicant, whatever his cause, and Anti-Slavery lecturers among the rest. It was thought not best to come down to particulars, but to establish what would operate as a general rule of exclusion.

On reaching the second of the above resolutions, the Association was prepared to launch its heaviest shaft at the abolition lecturers. Here the ecclesiastical influence was put forth in the most prudent and forcible way. An appeal was made to the respect of the people for their established ecclesiastical bodies. An alarm was sounded—not that such men as the Rev. Drs. A. and B., and the Rev. Mr. C., would lose their influence if abolition lecturers were permitted "to enlighten the churches" "*without the advice and consent of the pastors and regular ecclesiastical bodies*;" but that the "*pastoral office*" was endangered! Happy abstraction! Judicious exaltation of the cloth in place of

the men! How immeasurably would the dignity and force of the resolution have suffered, by inserting, instead of stated ministry, the names A., B., C., D., &c., of the stated ministers! But what was meant by this general phylactery of the "pastoral office"? The operations of agents, without the advice of pastors or the regular ecclesiastical bodies, would be "unauthorized" *by them* of course; but is theirs the sole authority for addressing men as men, in any given territory? Did the Association mean to say that it is *wrong* for an agent to attempt "to enlighten the churches" within the geographical boundaries of one of its pastorates or ecclesiastical bodies, without first obtaining leave? This would certainly be a step towards the infallibility of the Congregational church—an infallibility which the movers of these resolutions, as rational men, well knew the abolition lecturers would be in no haste to acknowledge. It is difficult to understand what the authors of it meant or expected to effect by this qualified, guarded, and solemn warning against "itinerant agents," but to prevent them from getting inside the Congregational meeting houses, leaving it to the authorities of the grog-shops to take care of them outside. On the third resolution we have nothing to say, except to mark its connection with the preceding. It was important to throw in a large category of obnoxious subjects, and mix them well together, so that the odium which anywhere or with any persons attached to one, might attach to all. The fourth resolution is a solemn recommendation to the churches to oppose, shoulder to shoulder, *all* those invasions upon "ecclesiastical order" which had been so luminously described in the preceding "resolutions." If the Association had not meant to involve in this magniloquent anathema Anti-Slavery lecturers, they would certainly have excepted them. Hence, we derive the important information, that, in case an agent of this society goes into any town in Connecticut, and, without getting the consent of the pastor or some regular ecclesiastical body, (whether he applies for it or not,) has the presumption to make an attempt in a private house, school-house, or barn, to throw some light upon the people, and among the rest upon the church, in regard to slavery, he is guilty of an invasion of the ecclesiastical order of the Congregational church! We have taken some pains to interpret the hieroglyphics of this matter, that the

good people of Connecticut may see the strictness and sacredness of the enclosure in which they are shut up.*

But, in sober earnest, let us inquire what course honest Christian men and Christian ministers ought to have taken. First, believing slavery inconsistent with the Gospel, they ought to have pronounced it a sin to buy and sell men under any pretence whatever. Knowing that the cry of millions has gone up to heaven, and that the thunderbolts of God can wait but little longer, they ought to have urged the churches under their pastoral administration most anxiously, prayerfully, and without delay, to inquire their duty and do it—to welcome light from every quarter—to prove all things, and hold fast that which is good. If they were satisfied that the American Anti-Slavery Society was wrong in its doctrines or measures, they should have plainly said so, and given their reasons—they should have been ready to discuss the matter before their people, and have it intelligently settled, so that the peace of the church might stand firm upon the foundation of known truth, and not depend upon the amount of ignorance which may be maintained within the palings of ecclesiastical supervision.

Let it not be supposed that we undervalue the "pastoral office," or set ourselves up as oracles of wisdom, worthy to control "by our own authority" the incumbents of that office. We rather "name it filled with solemn awe," as the most effectual safeguard of virtue ever established; and it is because we so regard it, and because the duty of the pulpit, in relation to slavery, seems to us perfectly within the range of common honesty to decide, that we have felt constrained to become the mouth of the down-trodden millions, to pour the rebuke of their poor murdered hearts upon the men who have turned God's institution of choicest mercy into an instrument of tyranny and wrong. There never was a claim more touching, or more imperative upon the sympathy and power of the Christian pulpit, than that of our brethren and sisters under the iron yoke of Southern bondage. Surely, the ministry of that Saviour who took the part of the houseless widow against the long-prayer-making hypocrites of his day, with all the sympathies of

* It is worthy of record, that a large number of ministers in Connecticut held these proceedings in just contempt, and refused to read the resolutions to their people.

his overflowing heart, should have been the first to raise their voices for the bought and sold victims of modern oppression; *they* should have been the first to take the part of their divine master's representatives trembling on the stand of the auctioneer, and quivering with the anguish of severed heart-strings. The Christian ministry, in the person of Christ himself, was the direct and fearless advocate of truth and suffering humanity, on all occasions, and under all circumstances; and it was designed to be so to the end of time. It was never meant to be the tool of selfish policy, or the ladder of ambition. It was never meant to be turned into a fashionable conscience-soother, for the exclusive use of genteel worshippers of mammon, doing their weekly penance to God in cushioned pews. The true minister of Christ is the noblest style of human nature. His heart is large enough to hold the entire brotherhood of man. When he sees a brother made the victim of wrong, he flies to his side, and is ready to receive the stabs in his own breast. His mind seeks only for truth. There is no intellectual adversary with whom he fears to cope, for he is principled to yield to every fair conviction of reason, come from what quarter the evidence may, as to the voice of God. *He* seek to fence out by authority certain opinions from his flock? *he* afraid for the dignity and stability of his pastoral office, if somebody else should attempt to instruct his people? "Never," he would indignantly reply: "even to my pulpit, on all proper occasions, I welcome the discussion of every subject within the scope of the Gospel. By truth, I cannot but be aided and blessed, even if it should cost me humiliation and repentance; and if the winged insects of error can fly into my pulpit and not singe their sooty pinions, then hath the candle of the Lord never been lighted in it. If, above all things, the purity, and ardor, and efficiency of my advocacy of the oppressed, does not so put to shame the zeal of quack pretenders, as to make my pulpit the last place they would ask to stand in, I will descend from it as unfit for its sacred responsibilities. What business have I, who pretend to be a teacher of truth, either to shrink from scrutiny, or to suffer error to mock me in my very citadel, and triumphantly to defy the armies of the living God? Has the temper failed from my spiritual weapons, that I should ensconce myself in brick and mortar? Let God send upon his people poverty and reproach, blasting and

mildew, famine and the sword; but oh! let him spare them the curse of a feeble, time-serving ministry, cowering from the contest of free discussion, and nursing their craven hearts behind the ramparts of ecclesiastical order."

What wonder is it that in a land where men and women are raised as a commodity for the market, and the greatest and most profitable internal traffic is that in human flesh, and the great body of moral and religious teachers are dumb if not blind to the sin, the efforts of abolitionists should be opposed by brute force?

The history of the past year, like that of the preceding, shows that mobs are the direct fruit of a northern defence of slavery. They stand in place of the arguments which should support those ecclesiastical proceedings on which we have already dwelt. They are resorted to, whenever it is supposed that abolitionism is too weak to turn them to its own account,—but however sanguine the hopes of the instigators, they have never failed to end in disappointment.

It is little to be wondered that mob-law should reign paramount in the slave states. All the statute laws in favor of slavery are virtually mob-laws, being founded in the principle that might makes right. The mobocratic proceedings in the state of Missouri, in the year 1836, can excite the surprise only of those who are ignorant of the nature of slavery. An affray occurred in the city of St. Louis in which a civil officer was slain by a colored man. The criminal was imprisoned for trial. His crime itself was not of so aggravated or extraordinary a nature as to induce his fellow-citizens to anticipate the certain vengeance of the law, but his color rendered it more than they could bear. A mob hurried to the prison, broke it open, and with savage yells chained the prisoner to a tree and roasted him to cinders! The character of the city seemed to require a legal investigation, and accordingly the matter was brought, by a judge, very significantly named Lawless, to the notice of the Grand Jury. In his charge to the jury the judge used the following remarkable language:

"I have reflected much on this matter, and after weighing all the considerations that bear upon it, I feel it my duty to state my opinion to be, that, whether the Grand Jury shall act at all depends upon the solution of this preliminary question, whether the destruction of McIntosh was the act of the '*fer*,' or the act of the *many*."

The natural consequence of this judicial approbation and sanction of mob-law, was, not only that the murderers of

McIntosh went unpunished, but that the only press in St. Louis, which dared to question the rightfulness of mob-supremacy, was torn to pieces, and its editor, the Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy, was obliged to flee to a free state. Freedom of opinion was also trampled under foot in Marion College. The Rev. Dr. Nelson, a most excellent clergyman, a native of the South and once himself a slaveholder, with all others who were known to be opposed to slavery, and refused to bow the knee to its "dark spirit," were banished from the state on pain of torture and death.* But how miserable the

* The occasion of the outrage upon Dr. Nelson, was an occurrence at a religious meeting which is thus described by a correspondent of the New-York Journal of Commerce, and believed to be substantially correct:

"At the close of the meeting Col. Muldrow handed a paper to Dr. Nelson to read, proposing to subscribe \$10,000 himself and asking others to subscribe, to indemnify masters for their slaves when government should think proper to abolish slavery in that way. Upon this a Dr. Bosley came forward, abusing Dr. Nelson, and charging him with being the cause of all the disturbance. Colonel Muldrow then proclaimed himself the author of the paper, and that he, if any one, was to blame. An altercation immediately ensued between them, during which Bosley struck Muldrow with his cane. After receiving the blows, Muldrow drew his knife, opened it deliberately, and laid it at full length in the palm of his hand. Bosley then drew a pistol, and snapped it at Muldrow, and then attacked him with a sword cane. Muldrow immediately closed with him, and in the scuffle Bosley was stabbed under the shoulder, the knife entering his lungs."

The mob now broke loose in full fury. At the earnest request of his friends Dr. Nelson fled, with his family, to Illinois. Subsequently one of his sons returned to take care of his property, and was seized with a fever. This brought his father to his bedside, where, while watching over his delirious ravings, with the anxiety of a fond parent, he received the following epistles, signed, the first by twenty-five, and the last by ninety names of the principal men of the place.

"DR. NELSON,—Sir, We, the Citizens of Palmyra, having understood that you passed through our town this day; thus openly disregarding the instructions heretofore given you, and your positive pledge to obey, immediately convened for the purpose of following you and inflicting on you such punishment as your conduct as an abolitionist and disturber of our peace deserves. But having afterwards learned that you had been sent for to see an afflicted son, have adopted this means as the most proper on such an occasion.

"This will be delivered you by Messrs. Richardson and Johnson, who are instructed to inform you that unless you immediately leave this county, never to appear here again, you may expect to receive such treatment as the feelings of an outraged community may dictate. WILLIAM BLAKELY, *Pres't.*"

"Resolved, That we, the citizens of Palmyra and Marion County, whose names are hereunto subscribed, present to Dr. David Nelson the following letter as an expression of their views and determination:

"DR. DAVID NELSON,—Sir, We are satisfied after the transaction of recent events, of which you have borne a conspicuous part, that your residence among us is incompatible with the peace of our community, we are satisfied that you must be continued to be regarded as an object of distrust and of danger; we had believed that you yourself were impressed with this conviction and had determined to leave our borders, still we find you returning into the bosom of our society, and, as we are informed, expressing a determination to abide with us at your option. This can never be; we will not disturb you while watching over the illness of your child—but when that illness shall have been determined, we insist upon your departure from our state not to return, we hope that you may on reflection concur with us in the propriety and necessity of your departure, but however this may

guilty peace which the slaveholders have purchased by this high-handed tyranny. Mr. Lovejoy has re-established his press at Alton, in the state of Illinois, and is doing ten times

be, we feel it our duty to assure you that our abiding determination is to accomplish this object."

Mr. A. C. Garratt, one of the exiles, gives the following account of his treatment by the mob:

"My case was then held up for investigation. Lawyer Wright was appointed spokesman. On his calling for the manner of punishment, some proposed tar and feathers, others 100 lashes, others to take me to Palmyra, and keep me there until night, then daub me with tar, and burn me with the books. Mr. W. finally made a proposition, to which they agreed, which was, that I must either receive 150 lashes, or leave the state. But when they found I preferred the lashes to being driven from the state, they would not let that stand, but made another, which was, that I must have 150 lashes *well laid on*, and if I lived through it, I must lose my life if found within the bounds of the state after the following Saturday. Seeing that it was impossible for me to accomplish any thing under these circumstances within the state, I concluded to leave it. Upon these grounds they released me, taking the books with them, which I wished them to read, and added, I hoped they would do them good. But before we separated, Mr. Wright was appointed to reprimand me. After he was done, I wished to defend myself by a reply. But they all cried out, 'We won't hear him.'"

The man who was thus stripped of his rights as an American citizen was of most estimable and upright character. His trustworthiness may be judged from his being the superintendent of the Marion College farm. After the banishment of Mr. Garratt and his companion Mr. Williams, also connected with the College, "a public meeting of the citizens of Palmyra, and of Marion County, assembled, pursuant to notice, on Saturday, May 21, 1836," at which the following, among other resolutions, was passed:

"*Be it therefore Resolved*, That we approve the recent conduct of a portion of our citizens towards Messrs. Garratt and Williams (two avowed advocates and missionaries of abolition) who came among us to instruct our slaves to rebellion by the use of incendiary pamphlets, by pictorial representations of imagined cruelty, and by other artful appeals to their passions, eminently calculated to weaken the obligations of their obedience, as characterized by that decision, mildness and dignity, which become a people acting on the principle of self-defence."

The following from the minutes of the same meeting deserves to be placed on record to show both the tyranny of slavery, and the horrible guilt to which what is called "benevolent" slaveholding necessarily leads.

"S. W. B. Cannegy, Esq., then rose and remarked, that as some degree of excitement existed in this community in relation to the connexion of Marion College with the views and designs of abolitionists, and as some evidence of an unfriendly feeling had manifested itself towards the principles of that institution, which he believed was founded in a mistaken opinion of the sentiments and action of these gentlemen upon this subject, he would therefore move, that the Rev. E. S. Ely, one of the professors in Marion College, be requested to state to this meeting his opinion, and the future course of conduct of that institution upon the subject of abolition—which was unanimously adopted.

"Dr. Ely rose and addressed the meeting. He said, that it was with pleasure he was able to deny all participation with the abolitionists of the North, either in opinion or action—that he was not now, and never had been, a favorer of the doctrine—that he regarded slavery as an evil, which could only be destroyed by legislative action, and he viewed those men who are now creating this excitement, as deficient in philanthropy and piety—that he was the absolute owner of one slave, and was at present contracting for others; and that all publications which in any degree connected him with abolition, were without his knowledge or consent."

Having accepted the humble submission of Dr. Ely, the meeting proceeded to

more against slavery than before.* Dr. Nelson, while preaching against slavery in Illinois, makes more converts to abolition in Missouri than he did before. And those

receive that of Marion College, in which the faculty declare that to be "illegal" which this very meeting had just declared to be contrary to no law.

"On motion of Henry Willcox, Esq., it was resolved, that John Roach be requested to read to this meeting a series of resolutions which were passed by the faculty of Marion College, on Friday, May 20, 1836.

"Mr. Roach then read the following extract from the records of the College:

"The faculty of Marion College utterly disapprove, as unchristian and illegal, the circulation of all books, pamphlets and papers, calculated to render the slave population of this state discontented.

"They utterly condemn any interference with rights guaranteed by the state of Missouri to the owners of slaves. They will therefore consider the following acts, on the part of any of the students of the College, fit subjects for discipline:

1st. The interference of any student in any of the families around us, by conversation with slaves or any remarks intended for the ear of the slaves, which may be in their nature calculated to produce discontent. 2d. The circulating of any pamphlets or other publications for the purpose of exciting the minds of blacks, and endangering the peace and security of the community. 3d. The holding of any meeting for the purpose of discussing the subject of slavery, at which blacks may be present. 4th. Instructing any slave to read without the consent of his owner being first expressed in writing. 5th. And inasmuch as concord, peace and freedom from all excitement, is essential to the prosecution of literary pursuits, we do hereby forbid all discussions and public meetings amongst the students, upon the subject of domestic slavery.

"I certify the foregoing resolutions and laws, to be a true extract from the records of the faculty of Marion College. S. C. McCONNELL.

* Since his removal to Alton, Mr. Lovejoy has used the following language in a reply to an article in the *Maine Christian Mirror*:

It has been, and still is, to me a source of great grief, to witness the course which you, brother Cummings, together with the editors of the *Vermont Chronicle*, the *Boston Recorder*, and the *New York Observer*, have pursued on the subject of slavery. These are all brethren, whom, (though I have not the happiness to know them personally,) I highly respect. Separately, and together, you wield an incalculable moral influence, and I need not say, that your responsibilities are correspondingly great. These brethren will, I am sure, pardon me, if I speak seriously, and in earnest, on this subject, for I speak in behalf of more than two millions of my fellow-beings, who are not permitted to open their mouths to plead their own cause. And I therefore tell you plainly, that you seem to me not at all to have understood your responsibilities, in relation to the subject of slavery, or else to have trifled with them in a manner truly awful. I have seen the "*Mirror*," once and again, give the subject the go-by, with a dry joke or a half-concealed sarcasm, which none understand how to use better than he; I have seen the "*Recorder*" and the "*Chronicle*," with column after column of their pages occupied by their acute and logical-minded editors, in reasoning coldly about sin and slavery in the abstract, when the living and awful reality was before them and around them; disputing about words and terms, and the precise amount of guilt, even to the twentieth part of a scraple, to be attached to this or that slave-holder, as coolly, and with as much indifference, as if no manacled slaves stood before them, with uplifted hands and streaming eyes, beseeching them to knock off their galling, soul-corroding chains. I have seen the "*New-York Observer*" publish,

who think the fire of abolition is extinguished in Missouri itself, are much mistaken.

But when we read the history of anti-abolition, or rather anti-free-discussion, mobs in our own *free states*, there is good cause for astonishment, and, especially, when we see that these mobs are always the work of the wealthiest and best informed class of society. The mob which occurred last summer in Cincinnati, so well illustrates both the nature and tendency of these outrages against liberty and law, that we need dwell on no other.

The Philanthropist, edited by James G. Birney, Esq., a native of Kentucky, and not long since a slaveholder in the state of Alabama, was established at New Richmond, a village on the Ohio, twenty miles above Cincinnati, in January, 1836. About the middle of April, of the same year, it was removed to Cincinnati, and there published without molestation till the 12th of July. Its columns were held open to the advocates of slavery and opponents of abolition, and though fully and unflinchingly advocating the doctrines of this society, it could never be reproached for want of forbearance and courtesy in its language. Even its enemies were obliged to concede that its *mode* of conducting the discussion was perfectly unexceptionable. At midnight, on the 12th of July, the printing office of the Philanthropist was entered by a band of conspirators, and considerable damage done to the press and types. Threats were thrown out of a repetition of the outrage, in a more serious manner, unless the publication was abandoned. The mayor of the city, S. W. Davies, in offering a small sum, placed in his hands by a citizen for that purpose, as a reward for the apprehension and conviction of the conspirators, took occasion to add,

"And I do earnestly entreat those persons whose proceedings, it is alledged, have prompted to the commission of the riot complained of, as they value the quiet of the city, to abstain from the further prosecution of such measures as may have a tendency to inflame the public mind, and lead to acts of violence and disorder, in contempt of the laws and disgraceful to the city."

The pro-slavery presses of the city as a natural consequence, opened in full cry upon the devoted editor of the

week after week, and send to its hundred thousand readers, the most partial and injurious representations of the characters and motives of those engaged in freeing the slave from bondage, while its columns have been hermetically sealed to all reply or confutation. And, as I have seen these things, I have asked myself, how long, oh! how long, shall these beloved, but mistaken brethren continue to abuse their influence, pervert the truth, and retard the salvation of the slave?

Philanthropist. Handbills were posted at the street corners offering a reward for his delivery, as a fugitive from justice, to "Old Kentucky." The muckworms of trade were invoked against him as "injuring the prospects of the city," and all true patriots, as a disturber of the "glorious union." But he went on undismayed. On the 21st of July, a very remarkable meeting was called in a still more remarkable manner, by a card which deserves to be put on the page of history, as one of the facts which may go to settle the question whether this is a free country.

PUBLIC MEETING.

"A meeting of the citizens is requested on Saturday evening next, at 6 o'clock, at the Lower Market House, in Cincinnati, to decide whether they will *permit* the publication or distribution of Abolition papers in this city. It is requested that Nicholas Longworth, Jacob Burnet, Morgan Neville, David Loring, John C. Wright, John P. Foote, Charles Tatem, Anthony Harkness, David T. Disney, Charles Ross, David Griffin, A. L. Vorhees, Wm. Phillips, Hamilton Lyon, Thomas W. Bakewell, Archibald Irwin, John H. Groesbeck, Josiah Lawrence, Robert Buchanan, Jabez Reynolds, Sanders Hartshorne, Geo. W. Neff, William Burke, Benjamin Urner, Wm. Greene, Samuel Perry, Geb. P. Torrence, Joseph Gest, Wright Smith, Lewis Shoveley, Joseph Talbot, Dr. Whitman, Allen Wilson, Archibald Gordon, John Leatherbury, John Wicks, James Goodloe, Willis Tatem, Jacob Strader, Samuel Talbot, Jacob Resor, and R. F. L'Honmedieu be a committee to prepare resolutions and submit the same to the meeting, that shall fairly and decisively be a test of the people, it being alleged that there is a settled determination existing in an overwhelming majority of the citizens to put down the alleged evil by FORCE if admonitions are found insufficient. The peace of our city requires that the voice of the community be known."

The meeting was held according to call, and being at a convenient hour* for the multitudes of persons in the employ of the callers, was numerously attended. A distinguished citizen, postmaster of the city, and minister of the Gospel, presided over it. The preamble adopted by the meeting, deprecated the "existence of slavery as a great evil," but denounced the abolitionists as injuring their "business and prosperity;" recognized "the constitutional right of liberty

* The Editor of the Cincinnati Gazette, who stood by the right of free discussion during this storm, says of this call:—This it must be noted is rather a new mode of calling a town meeting. Here is the explanation. Nicholas Longworth, Morgan Neville, and some others of the committee named, came to a determination, that the abolition paper should be put down, '*peaceably if it could, forcibly if it must.*' They devised the plan of this meeting. Without consulting them, the names of some of the most respectable men of the city were set down on the Committee. The meeting was appointed at the hour when most of those who labor in the foundries and ship-yards, and elsewhere, would be discharged from labor for the week, and at a place convenient for their assembling. It was anticipated that most of the gentlemen named, would commit themselves to the object of the meeting by remaining silent, either from real apprehension, or from repugnance to controversy. The anticipation was verified.

of speech and of the press, in its utmost extent," but felt it duty to utter a warning voice to those concerned in the promulgation of abolition doctrines. This warning the meeting proceeded to utter in a string of minatory resolutions, from which we extract three, the last of which threatens and justifies a resort to the *ultima ratio*, the doctrine of revolution—a rebellion against law to secure the peace and permanency of a government !*

"*Resolved*, That in the opinion of this meeting nothing short of the absolute discontinuance of the publication of the said abolition paper in this city, can prevent a resort to violence, which may be as disastrous to its publisher and supporters, as it must be to the good order and fair fame of our city."

"*Resolved*, That we will use all lawful means to discountenance and suppress every publication in this city which advocates the modern doctrines of abolitionism."

"*Resolved*, That we entertain the most profound respect for the memories of the venerated Patriots of more than "sixty years since" who in the harbor of Boston, *without* the sanction of law, but in the plenitude of the justness of their cause took the responsibility of re-*shipping* the Tea Cargo, and for which illegal act they were entitled to and did receive the warmest thanks and gratitude of every lover of good order and well-wisher of his country—and that we in imitation of the noble and fearless example set us by those true-hearted Americans, declare that whenever we shall find an existing evil—wicked and mischievous in its conceptions—*waiting* against the best interests and happiness of our common country by its effects—aiming at the destruction and disunion of our happy government; and not only prompted and sustained by those untiring engines of human ambition, hope of gain and love of notoriety—but shielded from legal enactment according to the usual practice of our laws so as to leave us but one channel through which we can rid our fair land from its withering influence, that in seizing that one tangible point our exertions shall be firm, united, and decided."

* The first of the resolutions, all of which passed *unanimously*, is as follows :—

"*Resolved*, That the spirit exhibited by the immediate supporters of the abolition press in this city, is entirely at variance with the feelings and opinions of the great mass of our population, is as unjust to our sister states, as it is prejudicial to our own quiet and prosperity."

Now, the Vice President of this meeting was also a member of the Central Texian Committee of Cincinnati, and was probably present with others of his Market House compeers at a "Texas Meeting," of a previous date, at which the following resolutions were passed *unanimously* :—

"That, we regard every war designed for the subversion of Tyranny and establishment of Liberty, as a *holy* war, entitled to the strong sympathy and ardent support of every freeman."

"That all laws, international or domestic, having a tendency to enslave mankind, or any portion of the human family, are unnatural, a libel upon Heaven—and, being instruments enacted 'by tyrants,' for their own benefit, ought not to be recognized by freemen as an obstacle preventing them from lending their assistance to the Texians, or any other people struggling for liberty."

The meeting also appointed a Committee of thirteen persons, "to wait upon James G. Birney and his associates," to remonstrate with them, request them to desist from the publication of their paper, and to warn them that if they persisted the meeting could not hold themselves "responsible for the consequences." That it may be seen who the persons were that permitted themselves to be sent on this unrighteous and unconstitutional errand we give their names and characters as stated in the Cincinnati Gazette, adding that *eight* of the thirteen were members of Christian churches.

Jacob Burnet—He is known as a man of wealth, a lawyer of the first eminence, a Supreme Judge, a Senator in Congress, a citizen of extensive influence.

Josiah Lawrence—A merchant of high character, and President of the Lafayette Bank.

Robert Buchanan—Also a merchant of high reputation—late President of the Commercial Bank of Cincinnati.

Nicholas Longworth—A lawyer, retired from practice—the most extensive property holder in the city.

Oliver M. Spencer—A Minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, a man of wealth, and highly esteemed in the city.

David Loring—A large property holder, one of the most enterprising and active business men of the city.

David T. Disney—Has been a member of both Houses of the Ohio Legislature, and Speaker of both; an influential politician, conversant with the interests of the city, and extensively engaged in business.

Thomas W. Bakewell—A wealthy and highly respectable merchant.

John P. Foote and William Green—Gentlemen of Intelligence and wealth, and proprietors of a large stock in the Cincinnati Water Works. No men stand better in society.

William Burke—Postmaster of the city, and a Minister of the Gospel.

Morgan Neville—Known throughout the country, and esteemed wherever he is known.

Timothy Walker—A respectable lawyer; one of the law lecturers in the Cincinnati College.

Here is a fair exposition of the real instigators, the life and soul of the Cincinnati riot. This appointment was made on the 23d of the month. The Executive Committee of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society, under whose direction the Philanthropist is published, not feeling very deeply their responsibility to the censors of the press thus appointed over them, exercised the patience of the Market House Committee till the evening of the 28th, when they admitted them to a conference at the house of one of their members. The dignified judge and senator, at the head of the Market House Committee, dwelt on the inexpressible excitement against the abolition press and the importance of a prompt

decision. The business of the city, threatened by the doctrines of equal rights, was also held up, the loss of southern customers with their slaves from the hotels and boarding houses, &c. On their part, the abolitionists offered to discuss the whole subject with any man or men, in public. But the Market House Committee would hear of nothing but the "discontinuance of the Philanthropist—and total silence on the subject of slavery." As the only alternative, in case of refusal, they threatened or predicted, it seems of little consequence which, "a MOB—unusual in its numbers, determined in its purpose, and desolating in its ravages."* The chairman expressed it as his opinion, that it would be one of unprecedented character—that it would consist of *four or five thousand persons*, bent on the wide destruction of property, and *that two-thirds of the property-holders of the city would join it*. That it would be utterly vain for any man or set of men to attempt to restrain it—it would destroy any one who would set himself in opposition to it." The Market House gentlemen being asked whether if a mob could be averted, *they* would be willing the Philanthropist should be continued, the chairman and several others promptly answered, *they would not*. The abolitionists were allowed till the next day at noon to give their final answer whether they would discontinue the Philanthropist, when they not only returned a negative, but a number of solid reasons for sticking to their constitutional right. For this heroism of the eight men who composed the Executive Committee of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society, worthy of as many statues of gold, the dignified embassy from the Market House were doubtless ill prepared. It now only remained for them to rally their wretched tools and having filled them with lies and liquor, carry into execution their bootless threat, the best way they could. The ambassadors resigned their commission in season for the next morning papers; the tocsin was sounded, at 6 o'clock on the evening of the 30th, a mob was regularly organized, with chairman and secretary, and resolved first that the press should be destroyed and the types thrown into the street, and secondly that Mr. Birney should be notified to

* Narrative of the late Riotous Proceedings against the Liberty of the Press in Cincinnati, &c., page 35.

leave the city in twenty-four hours. A little after dark the work was commenced, the types were scattered, the press broken and thrown into the Ohio, and the office thoroughly pillaged. The mob then proceeded to the houses of Mr. Birney and others, but not finding their prey turned their fury upon the houses of some poor colored people. Here they met with resistance that somewhat cooled their zeal, and at length, at about midnight, they were dismissed by the worthy Mayor, with the following truly paternal speech:*

"Gentlemen—It is now late at night, and time we were all in bed—by continuing longer, you will disturb the citizens, or deprive them of their rest, besides robbing yourselves of rest. No doubt, it is your intention to punish the guilty, and leave the innocent. But if you continue longer, you are in danger of punishing the innocent with the guilty, which I am convinced no one in Cincinnati would wish to do. We have done enough for one night. ["three cheers for the Mayor."] The abolitionists themselves, must be convinced by this time, what public sentiment is, and that it will not do any longer to disregard, or set it at naught. [three cheers again] As you cannot punish the guilty without endangering the innocent, I advise you all to go home. [Cries of home! home! from the crowd drowned the balance of his harangue.]"

This mob, so dignified and distinguished in its leaders, was destined to be no less remarkable in its results. It multiplied Abolitionists in Ohio and throughout the free states; it enlarged the patronage of the Philanthropist, and gave it a more secure home in Cincinnati; and it stamped the seal of infamy and political reprobation upon all who were known as its instigators. ~~It~~ the y was short in which they dared to glory in their deed, ~~and~~ it will never return.†

* Reported by a gentleman present.

† Mobocrats have frequently, during the year, felt the salutary operations of law. The following is a copy of a paper signed by five young men, who were the leaders in a mob in Washington, Pa., in June last, when Mr. Gould and the audience were violently assailed during lecture.

They were indicted; and on the eve of trial they prepared a compromise, which was agreed to, the paper entered on record, and the nolle prosequi executed.

(COPY.)

Commonwealth, vs. James Ruple, jr. H. W. Sample, Joseph Dillow, Jas. O. Willson, Wm. Sloan.	}	We, the undersigned, defendants in case, being now sensible of the gross impropriety of our conduct in the breach of the peace, and in any and all the acts of violence which were perpetrated towards the members of the Washington Anti-Slavery Society, and the audience assembled at the Cumberland Presbyterian meeting-house, on the evening of the 21st of June last, thus publicly express our sorrow and regret, for any participation which either of us may have had in the transactions on that occasion. We also hold as true, in every instance, that the laws of the land ought not, and cannot be violated with impunity. If the prosecution be withdrawn, we agree to repair all damages to the meeting-house, and pay the costs of prosecution.
---	---	---

H. W. Sample,
James R. Ruple,
Joseph Dillow,
James Orr Willson,
William Sloan.

It would altogether transcend the limits of a report to notice the innumerable outrages of peace and good order which have been resorted to in the free states, to support the cause of slavery, and put down free discussion. But we will notice two most brutal assaults which have been committed upon Northern citizens at the South. How long will Northern men disgrace themselves by bootless violence in behalf of states in which even they could only travel at the peril of their lives? No northern man is safe at the South, against whom it is possible for the most jealous slaveholder to entertain a suspicion.

Aaron W. Kitchell, a citizen of New-Jersey, of respectable connections, a graduate of Princeton college, and licentiate of the Theological Seminary, while travelling at the South, was brought before a meeting of the citizens of Hillsborough, Georgia, on the 8th of June, 1836. The proceedings, as given by a correspondent of the Newark Daily Advertiser, show the treatment he received.

"Cuthbert Reese, Esq. was appointed Chairman, and Dr. A. T. Ridley, Secretary. Wm. Phillips, Esq. having stated the object of the meeting, a committee was sent for Dr. R. Thomas, who was said to be in possession of facts to confirm the intelligence that Kitchell had been holding communication with the black population. Dr. Thomas accordingly came forward, and confirmed the statements set forth in the letters. Kitchell was then taken and examined, and *failing to give any satisfactory account of himself*, on motion of Col. F. N. White, the following committee of twelve was appointed to report a course of proceeding, viz.: Isaac T. Moreland, Wm. Phillips, Wilkins Jackson, Dr. R. C. Clayton, Thomas J. Smith, Joseph C. White, Major Weekes, A. Alexander, John G. Morris, Esq., and James Johnson, Esq.

The Committee retired, and after deliberation made the following report, which was *unanimously adopted*, viz.:

The Committee to whom was referred the case of the Rev. A. W. Kitchell, report—That upon examination, they find sundry certificates and other papers of a suspicious and spurious character, and have thought proper to retain the same in the hands of the secretary until further information is obtained concerning them.

The Committee would advise that said Kitchell should be rode around the village on a rail, with a band of all kinds of music playing the Rogue's March—that his head should then be turred and feathered, and again rode round the village as before—that he should also leave the state within ten days from this time, under the penalty of Lynch's Law.

Upon motion, it was *Resolved*, That the proceedings of this meeting be published in the public gazettes of Milledgeville, with a request that they be republished in all papers opposed to the fiend-like purposes of Northern Abolitionists.

CUTHBERT REESE, Chairman.

Robert A. T. Ridley, Secretary.

A further Committee was appointed, informally, I understand, to carry out the recommendation adopted by the meeting. Poor Kitchell was accordingly stripped, his head shaved, and a covering of tar and feathers substituted, and he carried about the town to the music of the Callithumpian band."

The suspicion of abolitionism proved altogether false; otherwise, it is probable Mr. Kitchell would have atoned for.

his crime by the forfeit of his life. Three of the honorable citizens engaged in this outrage, *Ira E. Dupree*, *H. H. Tarver*, and *Henry Bunn*, have endeavored to vindicate their conduct by a public statement, in which they say—

“He was frequently heard of many miles from his place of abode, amongst the black population; and was, in one of his nocturnal and secret excursions,—with, no doubt, the fiendish intent to excite an insurrection,—discovered in the negro yard of a gentleman residing five miles from his residence, and actually refused to discover himself until CHASED DOWN BY DOGS.”

Mr. John Hopper, a respectable young merchant of New-York, was attacked by a mob in the city of Savannah, on the suspicion of his being an Abolitionist. His private papers were searched, and preparations were made by a crowd of half-intoxicated, blaspheming ruffians, to put him to death. By almost a miracle, he was rescued by the civil authorities, and lodged in prison for safe keeping. Not the slightest evidence appearing that he was an Abolitionist, he was permitted by the Mayor to escape. To the mere lack of proof that he was what every citizen has both a moral and constitutional right to be, he doubtless owes his life.

The Abolitionists defy the world to show that they have used any other than lawful, constitutional means; yet the bare suspicion of Abolitionism is a sufficient pretext in one-half the country for rushing over the guaranties of the Constitution, and committing brutal outrage upon the unoffending citizens of the other half. It is slavery, and not the Constitution, which governs the United States at the present time.

That it may more clearly be seen that it is the lash of the slave-driver which has reached over into the free states, to frighten the sons of pilgrim and revolutionary fathers out of their freedom of speech, and the preachers of the Gospel out of the tracks of Paul into those of Demas, let us trace the bloody instrument home, and see what it is doing there. Let us see whether the cases of Amos Dresser, Aaron W. Kitchell, and John Hopper, are any thing more than ordinary exhibitions of its doings in the land of its undisputed reign. The real character of plantation discipline, slaveholders are always anxious to conceal, yet the hardness of heart begotten by the fearful secrets cannot but reveal some of them. Said the Hon. B. Swain, of North Carolina, in 1830—

“Let any man of spirit and feeling for a moment cast his thoughts over this land of slavery—think of the *nakedness* of some, the *hungry yearnings* of others, the *flowing tears* and *heaving sighs* of parting relations, the *wailings* and *wo,*

the bloody cut of the keen lash, and the frightful scream that rends the very skies—and all this to gratify ambition, lust, pride, avarice, vanity, and other depraved feelings of the human heart. . . . **THE WORST IS NOT GENERALLY KNOWN.** Were all the miseries, the horrors of slavery, to burst at once into view, a peal of seven-fold thunder could scarce strike greater alarm."

Yet, strong as are the motives, and abundant as is the opportunity for concealment, outrage enough to justify the interference of all mankind might be proved from the testimony of the southern papers of the past year themselves. We give from some of them, and other credible sources, the following

CHAPTER OF ABOMINATIONS.

Flogging to Death.—A negro, the property of Mr. John Skinner, of Society Hill, S. C., was flogged by his overseer, one Bill Schenck, on the 25th ult., in such a severe manner, that he died the same evening. Schenck was examined before a justice, and *discharged.*—*Southern paper.*

AIKEN, So. Ca., Dec. 20, 1836.

To the Editors of the Constitutionalist :

I have just returned from an inquest I held over the dead body of a negro man, a runaway, that was shot near the South Edisto, in this District, (Barnwell,) on Saturday morning last. He came to his death by his own recklessness. He refused to be taken alive; and said that other attempts to take him had been made, and he was determined that he would not be taken. When taken, he was nearly naked—had a large dirk or knife, and a heavy club. He was, at first, (when those who were in pursuit of him found it absolutely necessary,) shot at with small-shot, with the intention of merely crippling him. He was shot at several times, and at last he was so disabled as to be compelled to surrender. He kept in the run of a creek in a very dense swamp all the time that the neighbors were in pursuit of him. As soon as the negro was taken, the best medical aid was procured, but he died on the same evening. One of the witnesses at the inquisition stated, that the negro boy said that he was from Mississippi, and belonged to so many persons he did not know who his master was: but again he said his master's name was *Brown*. He said his own name was Sam; and when asked by another witness who his master was, he muttered something like Augusta or Augustine. The boy was apparently above 35 or 40 years of age—about six feet high—slightly yellow in the face—very long beard or whiskers—and very stout built, and a stern countenance; and appeared to have been run away a long time.

WILLIAM H. PRITCHARD,
Coroner, (ex officio,) Earnwell Dist., S. C.

✂ The Mississippi and other papers will please copy the above."—*Georgia Constitutionalist.*

Voluntary Death.—A colored man, acting as steward on board the Selma, was drowned at New Orleans, about a fortnight since, under the following peculiar circumstances:—

The negro, it seems, was a runaway slave, who had by some means obtained a set of free papers, and under the character of a freeman had been employed on several boats, but lastly on the Selma. Yesterday, the owner detected him on the boat, and seized hold of him to prevent his escape; but the negro, after a desperate struggle, succeeded in disengaging himself, and running to the wheel house, jumped down into the water, where it is believed he voluntarily drowned himself.

From the Clinton (Miss.) Gazette, July 23d, 1836. It needs no comment.

WAS COMMITTED

To the jail of Covington county, on the 26th day of June, 1836, by *G. D. Gere, Esq.*, a negro man, who says his name is

JOSIAH,

and says he belongs to John Martin, an Irishman living in the state of Louisiana, on the West side of the Mississippi river, twenty miles below Natchez. Josiah is five feet eight inches high, heavy built, copper color, *his back VERY MUCH SCARRED with the whip, and BRANDED on the thigh and hips in THREE or FOUR places*, thus, (I. M.) or (J. M.) the M. is very plain, but the I. or J. is not plain: *the rim of his right ear has been bit or cut off*. He is about 31 years of age, had on when committed pantaloons made of bed ticking, cotton coat, and an old fur hat very much worn. The owner of the above described negro is requested to comply with the requisitions of the law in such cases made and provided.

Williamsburgh, June 28th, 1836.

J. L. JOLLEY, Sheriff, C. C.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, }
Lenoir County. }

Whereas, complaint hath been this day made to us, two of the justices of the peace for the said County, by William D. Cobb, of Jones County, that two negro slaves belonging to him, named BEN (commonly known by the name of *Ben Fox*) and RIGDON, have absented themselves from their said master's service, and are lurking about in the counties of Lenoir and Jones, committing acts of felony. These are, in the name of the state, to command the said slaves forthwith to surrender themselves, and turn home to their said master. And we do hereby also require the sheriff of said county of Lenoir, to make diligent search and pursuit after the above-mentioned slaves; and them having found, to apprehend and secure so that they may be conveyed to their said master, or otherwise discharged as the law directs. And the said sheriff is hereby empowered to raise and take with him such power of his county as he shall think fit for the apprehension of said slaves. And we do hereby, by virtue of an act of the Assembly of this state, concerning servants and slaves, intimate and declare, if the said slaves do not surrender themselves, and return home to their master immediately after the publication of these presents, *that any person may kill and destroy said slaves by such means as he or they think fit, without accusation or impeachment of any crime or offence for so doing, or without incurring any penalty or forfeiture thereby.*

Given under our hands and seals, this 12th November, 1836.

B. COLEMAN, J. P. [Seal.]

JAS. JONES, J. P. [Seal.]

200 DOLLARS REWARD.—Ran away from the subscriber, about three years ago, a certain negro man named Ben, (commonly known by the name of *Ben Fox*.) He is about 5 feet 5 or 6 inches high, chunky made, yellow complexion, and had but one eye. Also, one other negro by the name of Rigdon, who ran away on the 8th of this month. He is stout made, tall, and very black, with large lips.

I will give the reward of one hundred dollars for each of the above negroes, to be delivered to me or confined in the jail of Lenoir or Jones county, or *for the killing of them so that I can see them*. Masters of vessels and all others are cautioned against harboring, employing, or carrying them away, under the penalty of the law.

W. D. COBB.

November 12, 1836.

The New-Orleans Bee, of the 14th October, says: "The slave who struck some citizens in Canal-street, some weeks since, has been tried and found guilty, and is sentenced to be hung on the 24th inst."

BURNING MEN IN ARKANSAS.—The Arkansas Gazette, of a recent date, says :—

“The slave *William*, who murdered his master some weeks since, (Huskey,) and several negroes, was taken by a party a few days since, from the sheriff at Hot Spring, and burnt alive! yes, tied up to the limb of a tree, a fire built under him, and consumed in slow and lingering torture!”

MURDER BY A NEGRO.—Mr. Wm. Avery, overseer of the plantation of James McConnell in Marshall County, Miss., was murdered by a negro, on the 29th of May. Mr. A. was *in the act of correcting the negro's wife*, when he was knocked down by a bludgeon, and beaten to death. Mr. A. was a *humane and kind* master, and the character of the negro without previous reproach; he is now in Raleigh jail awaiting his certain death.—*Memphis Paper.*

This William Avery may have been a northern man who resorted to the South to make a fortune. The following from the Johnstown Spy, published in Cambria County, Pennsylvania shows that there are northern men not unprepared to commit any barbarities required by their “brethren of the South.”

On Friday last, two colored men were brought to this place on a sled, who had been shot, one of them through the knee, and the other through the back. The circumstances in relation to this unfortunate affair, as far as we have been able to collect them, are as follows :—

The wounded negroes are said to be fugitive slaves, who had made their escape from their owners in Virginia. They were pursued by a number of persons, who had made several unsuccessful attempts to arrest them, until they had arrived within a few miles of this place, where they were again overtaken by the pursuers, who called to them to stop or they would shoot them. One of them turned round and replied that he would die before he would be taken, and at that moment received a rifle ball through his knee: the other started to run, but was brought to the ground by a ball being shot in his back. After receiving the above wounds, they made battle with their pursuers, and kept them off until they reached a house two or three miles from the place where they were shot, when becoming exhausted, they were unable to proceed farther. They were brought as before stated to this place, by the person who was authorized to take them. The persons who are said to have shot them are residents of this county.

The National Enquirer, of Philadelphia, says in regard to the case of Severn Martin, who was delivered up, as a fugitive from “service and labour” by a New Jersey Judge, but afterwards ransomed in Philadelphia for the sum of \$800.

The most outrageous cruelty was practiced, that was, perhaps, ever witnessed here, in cases of the kind. And after his arrival in Philadelphia, his captors exhibited the fell spirit of demons, in his treatment. We have been informed from unquestionable sources, that the man was beaten severely with a heavy stick, on the head and in the face; and, while he was suffering from the wounds inflicted, the monsters of slavite depravity performed the operation of **PULLING OUT HIS GRAY HAIRS!!!** His whiskers were also shaved off, to give him a younger appearance, that he might *sell to better advantage*. He was kept in irons about a week, and his limbs were much swollen by the friction of his manacles.

The Editor of the Cincinnati Philanthropist is voucher for the following fact :—

A Mr. James Fleming, who keeps the ferry on the Ohio river opposite Augusta, Ky. a few mornings since, about daylight, going down to his boat, discovered a skiff, coming across through the ice. He soon found a negro man was on board, who he imagined was a runaway. Consequently, he went out on the ice where the man was attempting to land, and proposed to assist him in making the shore. The negro replied, he did not wish any help—however, Fleming seized the bow of the skiff. The negro, apprehending his proffered assistance was made under cover of hypocrisy, leaped on the ice and cleared himself into the woods. Fleming then put his dog on the trail, and soon succeeded in running the poor fellow down. And, without the least form of trial, hurried him back across the river, where he was lodged in the Augusta jail for safe keeping."

All these horrible barbarities it must be remembered are but finger-boards pointing to a blood-neared temple of Moloch, the sanctuary of whose cruelties has never yet been thrown open to the public gaze. The following paragraph points to the penetralia of another demon, whose votaries would drown the voice of justice and mercy by the clamorous outcry of "Amalgamation !"

A VALUABLE SLAVE.—A very beautiful girl belonging to the estate of John French, a deceased gambler at New-Orleans, was sold a few days since for the round sum of \$7,000. An ugly looking bachelor named Gouch, a member of the Council of one of the Principalities, was the purchaser. The Picayune says that the girl is a brunette—remarkable for her beauty and intelligence : and that there was considerable contention who should be the purchaser. She was however persuaded to accept Gouch—he having made her princely promises.—*New York Evening Star*.

DOMESTIC SLAVE TRADE.

The past year has been one of unprecedented activity of the great internal Slave Trade. While the free have been shouting the praises of American liberty, and thanking God that they are not as the dark places of European, Asiatic and African despotism, American soil has been moistened by the bleeding feet of chained caravans, and an American sky has been pierced by the bitter lamentations of myriads of broken hearts ! We give a few of the sickening evidences of the extent of the traffic.

The *Virginia Times* proposes that the banking capital be increased from the money brought into the state from the sale of slaves. The Editor says,

"It may be objected by some, that the capital for so many new banks could not be subscribed, but when the immense amount of money that has been brought into the state by the sale of slaves, is considered, that objection is at once removed—we have heard intelligent men estimate the number of slaves exported from Virginia within the last twelve months at

120,000, each slave averaging at least \$600, making an aggregate of \$72,000,000. Of the number of slaves exported, not more than one-third have been sold, (the others having been carried by their owners who have removed,) which would leave in the state the sum of \$24,000,000, arising from the sale of slaves.

Another Southern paper contains the following paragraph.

HIGH PRICE OF NEGROES.—At Wadesborough, on Tuesday last, negro fellows, we learn, sold for 1300 dollars, and not very likely at that: there was a credit of twelve months. A feeling honorable to our nature withholds the most of us from parting with this kind of property, but it would be the true interest of this country to send our slave population to the South, if any thing like the present prices can be obtained. They certainly cannot earn the interest on their present value.

A slave broker in South Carolina publishes the following notice:—

NEGROES FOR SALE.—The subscriber, residing at Hamburg, S. C., at the second house from the Bridge, has on hand a likely parcel of Virginia negroes, and receives new supplies every 15 days. Persons wishing to purchase would do well to give me a call. I also wish to purchase 50 likely young fellows, for which I will pay One Thousand and Fifty Dollars a head or more, if the property is worth it. JOSEPH WOOD.

The following are specimens of the advertisements of slave traders in the General American Slave Market, the District of Columbia. It will be noticed that they do not advertise for entire families, but would tear away the young and strong.

[From the National Intelligencer.]

CASH FOR FOUR HUNDRED NEGROES, including both sexes, from twelve to twenty-five years of age. Persons having servants to dispose of will find it to their interest to give me a call, as I will give higher prices, in cash, than any other purchaser who is now in this market.

I can at all times be found at the Mechanics' Hall, now kept by B. O. Sheckle, and formerly kept by Isaac Beers, on Seventh-street, a few doors below Lloyd's Tavern, opposite the Centre market. All communications promptly attended to.

JAMES H. BIRCH,
Washington City.

[From the Same.]

CASH FOR FOUR HUNDRED NEGROES.—The highest cash price will be given by the subscriber for Negroes of both sexes, from the age of 12 to 28. Those who wish to sell will do well to give me a call, at my place on Seventh street, a yellow rough-cast house; the first on the right hand going from the market house to the steamboat wharf; or at A. Lee's Lottery Office, five doors east of Gadsby's Hotel. Those who wish to board their servants can be accommodated on moderate terms.

WM. H. WILLIAMS.

A New-Orleans Auctioneer, closes an advertisement for the sale of fifty-one "picked slaves" as follows :—

All the above described slaves bear a good character ; they were raised in the states of Virginia and Maryland, and *selected* with care.

Terms—One-third cash, payable into the hands of the notary on the day of sale, and the balance in notes at 4, 8 and 12 months, satisfactorily endorsed ; and if not paid at maturity, to bear an interest of 10 per cent till paid—but without giving the privilege of postponing the payment. The vendor guaranties only the title ; the defects known will be pointed out on the day of sale.

The Natchez Courier of a recent date estimates the slaves that have been transported from the older slave states to Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and Arkansas, during the year 1836, at TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND. If this estimate approximates the truth, the American trade exceeds the worst days of the African. And this whole trade, be it remembered, is placed by the Constitution as fully within the control of Congress as the African. It is to Congress that it looks for protection, and our general government is now actually engaged in seeking from a foreign power indemnity for cargoes of slaves that have become free by being driven by stress of weather upon shores where slavery cannot exist. What a mockery is our boasted law, making the African Slave Trade PIRACY, punishable with DEATH ! What an exhibition for the eyes of Europe, the model republic of the world, negotiating with one of her monarchies for the indemnification of PIRATES ! Is it not time for freemen to say through their representatives in Congress, we will no longer bear the responsibility of this crime ? Is it not time to say, at least, that if this outrageous commerce is suffered to live at all, it shall not stalk abroad on the highway of nations ? But, we do not mean to recommend half-way measures. Let Congress come up to the full extent of its power, and throw upon the states which wish to traffick in the bodies of their citizens, the responsibility of obeying or disobeying a righteous law. If there be a God in Heaven, as the end of all tyrants assures us there is, it is madness to look for peace and prosperity, as a nation, while such a traffic is allowed to exist. It is a common interest, and a common danger. We, the free laboring people of the northern states, call upon Congress to shield us from a piratical traffic in which our own fellow-citizens of the North, our next door neighbors, have

been enticed to embark their fortunes, to the jeopardy of themselves and us. Whether they lose or amass wealth by it, their participation in *piracy* is an injury to us. We have as much interest against the employment of northern capital in the slave-trade between Virginia, and New-Orleans, as against its employment in the same trade between Africa and Brazil. But for man-merchandise and forced labor, commercial affairs could not, on the untasked and exuberant soil of this young country, have come to the unhappy predicament in which we now see them. If, then, the federal government cannot touch the principle of forced labor, let it lay its whole power upon the principle of *raising laborers for sale*.

POLITICAL SUPPORT OF SLAVERY.

But "the dark spirit of Slavery" has its triumphs to boast, not only on the blood-stained track from Maryland and Virginia to the Southern cotton fields, but in our legislative halls, both State and National. It is true, that no Northern state has yet dared to comply with the arrogant demands of the South, and violate its own Constitution, by taking from its own citizens their freedom of speech. But many of them have declined, rather in the tones of willing slaves, than of indignant freemen. New-York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, refuse to protect the personal liberty of their own citizens by a jury trial. New-York with all her pretences to Democracy, has slighted the right of petition, with a haughtiness worthy of slaveholders themselves. The conduct of most of the free State legislatures, has been such as to encourage rather than repress the violation of law by the opponents of abolition.

The history of the twenty-fourth Congress, has, we believe, produced in the most intelligent minds, the conviction that liberty and slavery cannot long co-exist in this nation. Slavery must be extended through the North, or Abolition at the South. There is but one other alternative, a dissolution of the Government. The most sacred and important of all rights—that which, we are told, distinguishes freemen from slaves—we have lived to see trampled under foot. At the close of its first session, the House of Representatives passed a resolution, which was again adopted in its second session, "that all petitions, memorials, resolutions and pro-

positions, relating in any way, or to any extent whatever, to the subject of slavery, should, without being either printed or referred, be laid on the table, and that no further action whatever should be had thereon." [Passed at the first session—yeas 117, nays 68—at the second, debate being cut off by the *previous question*, yeas 129, nays 69.] In the celebrated report of Mr. Pinckney, which first recommended this resolution, it was not denied that Congress has the *right* to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia. The constitutional power of Congress to *protect* slave property is not only admitted, but the exercise of it is claimed by all slaveholders. Yet in relation to slavery, the right of the citizens to be heard for a redress of grievances, a right guarded expressly by the Constitution itself, has become a dead and buried right! In 1793 Congress passed a law authorizing the recovery of fugitive slaves, whereby any person in a free state may be seized as a fugitive from service or labor, and without a jury trial, upon proof, oral or written, to the satisfaction of such magistrate as the claimant may elect, may be hurried into hopeless slavery. Should the citizens of the free States deem themselves aggrieved by these summary and despotic proceedings, and petition Congress to repeal its own unconstitutional act, they are spurned from the footstool! They are doomed to learn that their servants have become their masters. It was not possible for Congress more clearly to violate the Constitution than it has done in regard to the right of petition. Not even an *ex post facto* law would have been a more palpable violation of the solemn oath by which every member was bound. To resolve that Congress shall neither hear nor consider any petition in regard to a subject confessedly within its power, is to "abridge the right of petition."

But the right of petition was abridged by the twenty-fourth Congress, not only as to the range of *subjects* on which the people may be heard, but as to *the classes of people* who may be heard on any subject. The proceedings to which we refer are the following in the House of Representatives, February 11, 1837 :

"An inquiry having been made by an honorable gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ADAMS,] whether a paper, which he held in his hand, purporting to be a petition from certain slaves, and declaring themselves slaves, came within the order of the House of the 18th of January, and the said paper not having been received by the

Speaker, he stated that in a case so extraordinary and novel, he would take the advice and counsel of the House.

"Resolved, That this House cannot receive the said petition, without disregarding its own dignity, the rights of a large class of citizens of the South and West, and the Constitution of the United States. Adopted, yeas 160, nays 35.

Resolved, That slaves do not possess the right of petition secured to the people of the United States by the Constitution. Adopted, yeas 162, nays 18."

The Honorable Ex-President of the United States, when he declared that he held in his hands a petition purporting to be from slaves, touched slavery between the joints of the harness. The case *was* "extraordinary and novel;" and the declaration that it was so, proclaims the secrets of the American prison-house in tones of thunder. It was a matter of no moment to the South, what was the prayer of the petition, it was enough for her to know, that it purported to come from SLAVES. Her mastiff statesmen snuffed the beggar before he raised the latch, and in the unappeasable clamor of their all barking at once, it was long before they could be made to understand the harmlessness of his errand, nor did they then bark the less furiously. Resolution after resolution concerning Mr. Adams was brought forward and urged upon the House in foaming haste, the mover of the first, altogether overlooking the circumstances, that the petition had not been presented, and that its prayer was not known. And it is not easy to say to what excess of riot the debate would have run, if a Virginian had not had the sagacity to discover and the manhood to say, that the South was making too large a draft upon common sense and common decency, to censure an honorable member for the mere fact of asking a reasonable question. But the rejection of the resolutions was supposed so strongly to imply that slaves *have* the right of petition, that the Southern delegation thought it time to resort to their standing tactics—a demonstration for the dissolution of the Union. They drew off in a body, and began to talk of blood and a Southern Convention. By the management of a man who had really more interest in the matter than any other, the President elect, Southern dignity and pride was propitiated by the passage of the above quoted preamble and resolutions. The first was offered by a whig representative from the city of Benezet, Rush, and Franklin; the second, by a professed democrat from the state of New York! The question of Mr. Adams, was, after all, not answered. But two doctrines were established, as "extraordinary and novel" in politics,

as was the case which called them forth. First, we are taught that the reception of petitions from one class of citizens, whatever may be their prayer, or whatever disposition Congress may make of it, may be a violation of the rights of another class. Thus, to apply the principle, it may violate the rights of the shoe makers of Lynn, for Congress to receive a petition from the India Rubber Company of Roxbury, or it may violate the rights of the democratic party, for Congress to receive a petition from the whigs, whether they pray for a National Bank, or against it. All this is contained in the first resolution, besides the mystery that the reception of a petition may violate the dignity of the House, and the Constitution of the United States! Secondly, we are taught that the Constitution of the United States did not design to secure the right of petition to those who have most need to use it, but only to those who already possess personal liberty, and its inseparable blessings; and that those to whom the *Constitution* does not secure the right, do not possess it. Whether they never possessed it, or possessing it before, were deprived of it by the Constitution, we are not informed. The class of persons who may petition, includes none who are not already masters of themselves, and in the free pursuit of their own happiness. It does include those who are powerful and rich, men who wish to turn their useless thousands into millions, by monopolizing, banking, using the public money, and the public land, or enslaving their fellow men. People whose grievances are tolerable or imaginary, may freely petition; but when a man's grievances become more than he can bear—when they consume him and drink up his spirit, when oppression has gone beyond his effects, and seized the cause—when a fellow citizen has set him with the dogs of his flock, and the cattle of his field—when all his social relations have been placed on the footing of brutality, for the gratification of another's will, and wrong has emptied the dregs of her last vial upon his head, and there is none to help—then it is, that he loses the right of petition. God hears the poor publican, and the ravens. He hears the poor stranger, whom the thieves leave by the way side, and sends his Samaritan. But the American Congress has an ear only for Pharisees and birds of Paradise. It listens only to the dignified prayers of the Priest and Levite!

Not less arrogant and unconstitutional, is the position ta-

ken by the President in his Inaugural Address. Repeating the assurance which he had given his slaveholding friends, before the election, that he should go into the presidential chair, "the inflexible, and uncompromising opponent of every attempt on the part of Congress, to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, *against the wishes of the slaveholding states,*" he thinks it proper to say, "It now only remains to add, that no bill conflicting with these views, can ever receive my constitutional sanction." Whether or not the veto power was granted to the President by the Constitution, merely to save him from the absurdity of ostensibly acquiescing in the violation of an instrument which he had sworn to support, it is believed that the unconstitutionality of the act of Congress has always, hitherto, been assigned as a reason for its exercise. Certainly no President has hitherto, pledged himself in advance, to veto any constitutional measure, out of regard to the interests or will of a section of the country. How strangely would such a pledge have sounded from the lips of George Washington, or John Adams, or Thomas Jefferson, or any other of the illustrious predecessors of Martin Van Buren! What President would have dared to pledge himself not to sustain the reduction or repeal of the Tariff, *against the wishes of the New England States?* The very reference of Mr. Van Buren to the "wishes of the slaveholding States," indicates that he will not rest his veto, if he has occasion to use it, on the unconstitutionality of the act. And in the same letter to his Southern friends, to which he refers as a full exposition of his sentiments, after having considered the question, as he acknowledges, "with a sincere desire to arrive at the conclusion, that the subject in respect to the District of Columbia, can be placed on the same ground on which it stands with respect to the States, viz: the want of constitutional power of Congress to interfere in the matter," he is obliged by "candor," to confess, that he has not been able to discover such a want of power—he has not been able to discover that Congress, having the power of "*exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever,*" has less power than Maryland and Virginia had over the same territory. "Thus viewing the matter," he adds, "I would not, from the lights now before me, feel myself safe in pronouncing that Congress does not possess the power of interfering with, or abolishing slavery, in the District of Columbia." It is not easy to say, what new light

may not dawn upon a man, who has "a sincere desire to arrive at the conclusion" most favorable to his political elevation, but there can be no reasonable doubt, that the President believes, *with his present light*, that a *majority* in Congress has a constitutional right to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia. Between this majority and a slaveholding minority, he takes his choice, and pledges himself to govern according to the wishes of the latter ! Is this doctrine, that the *minority* shall rule, the doctrine of republicanism ? Is it the doctrine on which Mr. Van Buren rose to the Presidency ? There may be a majority of the nation, with "*the lights now before them*," who are opposed to abolition in the District, but are they willing to bind themselves never to change their opinion ? Are they willing their public servant should pledge himself in a certain contingency, to disobey their reasonable commands ? Are they willing to set aside the old corner stone of our republicanism, that *the majority of the people shall rule according to the Constitution*, to make room for the new one, hewn out by the hands of Governor McDuffie, that *slaveholders* shall rule according to their *own* wishes ? It cannot have escaped the prophetic ken of so shrewd a statesman as our present Chief Magistrate, that he would lose by his pledge, more than he would gain at the North, hence we may infer that he gave it simply because he was driven to give it, as the condition of his receiving certain Southern votes necessary to his elevation.

True patriots will find it poor comfort to be told, that the President looks to the preservation of the Union. Has it come to this that the Union can only be preserved by a pledge from the Executive, that in a certain event, the majority shall be put under the rule of the minority ? The President has been careful to tell us that "the framers of our Constitution legislated for our country as they found it." Why, then, does not the President legislate for the country as he finds it ? Why does he pledge himself to regard a certain "domestic institution" in the capital of the country to be, what it is not, placed beyond the control of Congress ? Why does he legislate as if the *disturbance* of this institution, and not *the institution itself* endangered the harmony of the Union ? He informs us that in framing the Constitution, our fathers took into the account that "in some states existed domestic institutions, which, unwisely dis-

turbed, might endanger the harmony of the whole." Why then did they clothe Congress with the power of disturbance? Knowing that one branch of inter-state commerce, might be a commerce in the human species. Why did they grant Congress power to regulate commerce between the several states? Recognizing, at least, the possibility that the ten miles square for the seat of government might be ceded from slave states, why did they give congress "exclusive legislation *in all cases whatsoever*," within that ten miles square? And, above all, why did they forbid Congress to abridge the freedom of speech and of the press, and the right of petition on any subject? Why, in short, with their eyes open to all the dangers of the "domestic institution," did they leave for the abolitionists all the ground they now occupy? There is but one answer. *They looked upon slavery as an institution which must soon become extinct*. It can hardly be supposed that the South would have accepted the Constitution as it is, had they designed that slavery should be eternal; and it is certain the North would not. The South at that time admitted slavery to be an evil, unfortunately entailed upon us, and which could only be gradually removed. As one of the steps in this gradualism, they yielded the foreign slave trade, then supposed to be the life and soul of the system itself. Had they then been determined on perpetuating the system, they would have looked forward to the domestic slave trade as the substitute for the foreign, and would have excepted it from the control of Congress. In regard to the intent of the framers of the Constitution, the President has certainly taken things as they are not. But whatever may have been the intent or the policy of the framers of the Constitution, justice remains the same. Whatever their expectations, *we* have lived to see the working of an "experiment," which *they* only commenced. The fault we have to find with the President's account of the working of this experiment is simply, that it is not true. Having assumed the "provident forecast," of our fathers to have been what it was not, he adds that it "has been verified by time."

"Half a century," he proceeds to say, "teeming with extraordinary events, and elsewhere producing astonishing results, has passed along; but on our institutions it has left no injurious mark. From a small community, we have risen to a people powerful in numbers and in strength; but with our increase has gone, hand in hand, the progress of just principles; the privileges, civil and religious, of the humblest individual are still

sacredly protected at home; and while the valor and fortitude of our people have removed far from us the slightest apprehension of foreign power, they have not yet induced us, in a single instance, to forget what is right."

If this bright picture had been a reality, the "domestic institutions" of the South would never have been disturbed by the abolitionists. The truth is, that the lapse of the last fifty years *has* left upon our institutions, in the eyes of the civilized world, the brand of infamy. We have wonderfully increased, but with our increase has gone, hand in hand, the most cruel oppression, so that now, not only is one sixth part of our population deprived of every privilege, civil or religious, but the highest individual as well as the humblest owes his protection at home either to his complexion, or to his base subserviency to the behests of slaveholders. What an astounding contradiction to the President's assertions was it the destiny of the President himself to offer in the very act of presenting himself to take the oath of office! To that coveted honor he had found it impossible to rise without first prostrating himself before the genius of southern despotism, and staining his soul with a promise to sacrifice the interests, and wishes of a majority of the nation to the despot's will. While he affirmed that "the rights of the humblest individual are still protected," the price he was paying for the honors of that proud moment, was a pledge to uphold, even in opposition to the voice of the people, a system of tyranny, which puts in jeopardy the life of every *free* citizen of the North who visits the capital of his country! It may be true that "the *valor* and *fortitude* of our people "have not yet induced us, in a single instance, to forget what is right," but it is not true that we have not in more instances than one, forgotten the right. Let the fate of the noble tribes uprooted from our southern borders testify. Let our diplomacy with Mexico, and our conduct towards her rebellious province speak. Let an expensive and inglorious war, occasioned by a cotton planter's claim of property, to the wife of a brave Indian chieftain, bear witness.*

* The following is a note appended to an account of the celebrated Oceola, by M. M. Cohen, "Oceola, or Powell, as he was called by the whites, had a wife to whom he was much attached, whose mother was a mulatto slave, who ran away, was adopted by the Indians, and married one of their chiefs. Though the father was free, yet as children by law in the South, take the condition of the mother,

Let it be distinctly understood that in commenting upon the statements of the President with this freedom, we, neither feel any want of respect for his high station, nor are we moved by any party animosity. We yield to none of our fellow-citizens in our attachment to the form of government under which it is our happiness to live, nor do we undervalue the dignity of the important office to which the voice of an enlightened and self-governing people has called the author of this Inaugural Address. The cause we plead is infinitely above the political parties of our country, as the personal liberty of our laboring population is infinitely above the questions whether this or that man shall be elected President, or whether the Constitution shall be construed to give Congress a little more, or a little less power, or whether we shall have but one bank or a thousand. Among the most zealous advocates of immediate abolition are men who maintain the political principles on which Mr. Van Buren rose to his present office, and who probably gave him their personal votes. But such men have not been the last to express their honest indignation in regard to the pledge by which their votes have been made to support the system they abhor.*

We have a word more to say of the Inaugural Address. "Our system," says the new President, "purified and enhanced in value by all it has encountered, still preserves "its spirit of free and fearless discussion." A free and fearless scramble for wealth and office there may be. Abstract philosophers, sublimated out of the world of reality, may split hairs in freedom and safety, and so they may in Austria. But, if the free and fearless discussion of the highest practical interests of human life, is at home upon our soil, to whom do we owe it? Is it due to those who have administered our political system, or to those who have within the last five years periled life in the exercise of their rights? Another paragraph of the Inaugural Address decides this question. "Here and there, indeed," says this

Oceola's wife was seized as a slave by a person claiming her under the right of her mother's former master. The high spirited husband attempted to defend her, but was overpowered and put in irons by Thompson, who commanded the party. The event is incidentally related above. This transaction has been said to be the origin of the war in Florida."

* Many undoubtedly voted for Mr. Van Buren as a choice of evils. Mr. White denied the power of Congress to touch slavery in the District, and Gen. Harrison not only went as far as Mr. Van Buren in upholding the claims of the slave states, but added his approval of the abominable scheme of colonization.

self-confounding document, "scenes of dangerous excitement have occurred; terrifying instances of local violence have been witnessed; and *a reckless disregard of the consequences of their conduct, has exposed individuals to popular indignation.*" Here, from the very steps that lead up to the Presidential chair, comes forth the voice of that spirit of "mob law" and "Lynch law," which for some years past has triumphed from Florida to Maine over moral and statute law, and has put invention to the stretch for appalling forms of brutal violence whereby to crush the exercise of free discussion. If, under the reign of this spirit, the discussion of the most important of all practical subjects within the scope of religion or politics, has been "*fearless,*" it has been simply because hearts were enlisted on the side of the oppressed that knew not how to fear. The truth is, that when men have been so "reckless," as to incur the displeasure of some of the minions of slavery, by reviving the well nigh exploded doctrines of Jefferson's celebrated Declaration, and for this presumption have been ferociously assaulted, stoned, beaten, dragged through the streets, and threatened with death, the ministers of justice, in the very style of the Inaugural, have stood by and baptized the outrage "popular indignation"! and, instead of visiting upon the guilty the retribution of law, they have lamented that the innocent should be so "reckless of consequences," as to put themselves in a condition to need its protection! Here is "the spirit of free and fearless discussion, blended with unimpaired fraternal feeling"!

MEASURES.

Having reconnoitered some of the most important obstacles and enemies the American Anti-Slavery Society has to encounter, it remains to look at its resources and means of aggression, and to inquire how they are to be applied.

The great end at which we aim is, to subvert the relation of master and slave—not by machinery political or ecclesiastical, but by establishing in the hearts of men a deep and wide-spreading conviction of the brotherhood of the human race; that God hath indeed made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth; that all men who mean to obey the divine appointment, and honestly get their bread by their labor, have a common interest

in sustaining the principle that the laborer is worthy of his hire. Thanks to God, the people who cultivate the soil of the northern states have yet some power of volition and freedom of action in their own hands, and they can be made to see and feel that their brotherhood is rather with the honest but oppressed laborer of the South, than with the lordling who lives at ease upon his unrequited toil. They can show that it is not, as the pretended patriarchs claim, a law of society that the laborer should be a chattel. To get the hearts of our countrymen, we need only go to them with the truth, breaking through the spells of political chicanery and ecclesiastical usurpation, brushing aside the cobwebs of Colonizationism and prejudice, and laying open to their view the whole theory and practice of slavery in its length and breadth. There is nothing like the secrets of the great American prison-house to kindle the soul. Let them see, too, that the blessed Bible—a lens that brings to a focus the broad sunshine of Deity that falls upon the universe of his works, a thing too soul-kindling to be allowed in the dungeon of slavery—is all, all on our side. Let the friends of human rights get to the bottom of this book and understand its doctrines, and most amply can they revenge the use that oppression has made of it.

It is neither philosophical nor Christian to say, that enlightened, cordial sympathy for the oppressed, as it grows deeper and broader in these northern communities, will not act effectually upon the consciences of slaveholders. They are men; and multitudes of them are rather the dupes and slaves of the system of oppression than its authors. When they come to see that by the mass of the good and the free they are not hated as rivals or enemies, but regarded with benevolent concern as sinning brethren, whom the law of God compels us faithfully to rebuke, they cannot but feel, and seriously think. The providence of God throws thousands of slaveholders within our Abolition atmosphere: let them find that, instead of the homage which their slaveholding used to bring them, and does even now, they can expect only faithful reproof—that, instead of being courted and caressed, all that is good and noble will shrink from their fellowship, and they will go home prepared, if not immediately to emancipate their slaves, to join in the moral insurrection which is fast approaching.

The doctrine, that a man is a man, will not stop at niceties of

complexion. There is no tyranny more detestable, and deserving to be thrown overboard into a bottomless ocean of shame, than that which comes in between me and my neighbor, and claims by virtue of custom, the proprieties of time and place, the decencies of social intercourse, due respect for public opinion, &c., to graduate the respect I shall pay him according to the color of his skin. Against this tyranny, Abolitionists will continue to rebel: it deserves to be rebelled against for its own sake, and much more when it is acting as the armor-bearer of slavery. What! dwells there a soul in the man who can for one moment submit to that arrogant dictation which impudently intrudes into the privacies of the breast, and says, with a man whose complexion is so and so you must not associate, on pain of public censure? On this point, we fear Abolitionists have been too ready to yield, as they have fancied, for the good of the cause. We say, perish the cause which must needs make us treat a brother, whom we respect and love, as if we scorned him—because, forsooth, a prejudiced public will otherwise be displeased. There is no motive which can justify a man in acting at all in the line of the world's unjust custom, but the good of the individual, of which *he* must be the judge. If we are to wait till the thing is popular, or will not injure the cause, to use the fashionable parlance, before we grasp our colored brother by the hand, and bury the cord of separation, we may wait till the angel shall set his right foot on the sea and his left on the earth, and swear that there shall be time no longer. It is true, an Abolitionist may wish for and advocate the civil emancipation of those whom he would still be unwilling to associate with; but if color in itself, or public opinion is *the reason* why he does not associate with one with whom he otherwise would, he wrongs the cause in which he is engaged. Surely, when millions are groaning under the demon scourge of chattelism, and the circumstance of the color which God has pleased to give them is made the reason and the means of their bondage, the philanthropist should break through the tyranny of this prejudice, and wrest from the oppressor this weapon. Says the slaveholder, The difference of color is so marked, that the two races cannot live together in the same country in any other more peaceable relation than that of master and slave. Abolitionists, will you not show this to be a lie?

The mistake from which the public mind needs to be

relieved in regard to our colored brethren, is a complete exchange of cause and effect. It is supposed that the colored man is excluded from social and political equality with the whites because he is degraded, whereas he is degraded because he is excluded. The free colored man has not fallen from the level of civilized society—he has been prevented from rising to it. Released from brutal chains, he finds himself surrounded by a mass of men whose prejudices conspire to keep him down. He does not ask to be received and esteemed for what he is not, but simply for liberty to become what is worthy of estimation, and to be esteemed for what he is, without respect to his color. He asks simply for the same chance which in our republican country is awarded to all white men of the same standing. But how is he answered? In some states, by being branded as a vagabond or a felon, being compelled to give security for his good behavior and self-support, though chargeable with neither crime nor idleness. By being excluded from the common benefit of schools. By being excluded from honorable and profitable occupations. By being shut out of vehicles of locomotion, and places of innocent and useful recreation. By being marked every where as a burden to his country, fit only to be colonized to a foreign coast. By being set apart, as of another and inferior race, even in places of religious worship. By being refused a place, either on the bench of justice, at the bar, in the jury box, or the constabulary force. By being virtually, and to a great extent actually, refused any voice in making the laws—and when the rod of civil power is thus placed in the hands of his oppressor, being reproached for receiving more than his proportion of its blows! * Who can blame the colored man

* To sustain these assertions, we give some facts gathered from recent publications:—

"All free colored persons are obliged to have their title to freedom recorded, and to give bonds, renewable yearly, with five good and sufficient securities, in the penal sum of \$1000, for their good and orderly conduct, under a penalty of \$20, and an instant departure from the city, on the order of the Mayor, or imprisonment for six months on refusal."—*An ordinance of the corporation of Washington City, D. C.—Phil. Chronicle.*

"A public meeting held in Brinkley's District, Somerset County, Md., on the 2d instant, adopted among others, the following resolution:—

"*Resolved*, That all *free negroes*, who shall not leave the said District on or before the 1st day of September next, shall be considered as insurgents, and as opposed to the good order and well being of the white citizens thereof."—*Maryland paper.*

in such circumstances for being discouraged? Who can wonder that he should turn and prey upon the society which despises him and casts him out?

The marvel is, that with so little motive to do well, and so great provocation to do ill, the colored people as a class are no worse. Though the number of colored people con-

"At Zanesville, Ohio, a pious young woman opened a school for the neglected and ignorant colored people of that place. This so enraged the citizens, that they abused the teacher—entered the school house—destroyed spelling-books, geographies, arithmetics, NEW TESTAMENTS, and the furniture of the house—and finally succeeded in driving the school from the place.

"A missionary recently engaged in teaching the colored people at the "camps" in Brown's county, Ohio. The citizens burnt the school house—destroying spelling books, geographies, arithmetics, NEW TESTAMENTS, &c., and by threats, menaces, and actual inflictions, compelled the missionary to leave the ground."—*Pittsburgh Times*.

"A colored man, in the state of Ohio, at a meeting not long since, was the first, when awakened sinners were invited to come forward for prayer and conversation, who took the anxious seat. A leader in the meeting went up to him, and said, "Sir, you must not come forward here, for you will keep away many that we want to see among the anxious."—*Cleveland Messenger*.

"*Unprecedented Liberality*.—The following facts come to us duly vouched:—

"On the 31st ultimo, a colored man, in indigent circumstances, who has many entirely dependent upon him for a maintenance, (in the employ of Messrs. N. J. Elliott & Co.,) went to the Dry Dock Bank, and presented a check for \$1200; for which he was paid \$12,000. He did not discover the mistake until he attempted to deposite the amount in another bank; when he directly returned, and informed the teller of the error, who, with gratitude, received the \$10,800. The Board of Directors, being anonymously informed of the fact, determined to pay him \$25! to which the teller added \$10!

"If an African sun had not burnt upon this *honest man* "a complexion incompatible with freedom," would this stinted measure of gratitude have been deemed sufficient?"—*N. Y. American*.

"In a late publication of the New-York Zoological Institute, after setting forth their claims and eulogizing their attractions, the proprietors say, in a note—

"*The proprietors wish it to be understood, that PEOPLE OF COLOR are not permitted to enter, EXCEPT WHEN IN ATTENDANCE UPON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES.*"

"Some years since, a singular incident occurred in one of the courts of this city, [Phil.] When the sheriff was calling over the names of the jury, he summoned, among others, "George Jones." "Here, sir," answered a voice from the crowd, and a colored man came forth, and took his seat in the jury box.

"Here is some mistake," said the sheriff.

"No mistake at all. Here is your summons. My name has been regularly drawn, and it is on the jury list."

"The judge interfered, "You may retire."

"I'd rather not, sir. I am willing to perform my duty."

"Here was a dilemma. There was nothing in the law to exclude a colored man from the jury box, and the court was at a loss what to do. At length, the juryman was challenged by one of the parties, and had to leave the box. This is, we believe, the only instance of such an error; though it might be supposed that it would be of frequent occurrence."—*Penn. Sentinel*.

victed of crime is greater in proportion to their whole number than of the whites—as we might well suppose from their much smaller opportunity of evading the law - yet it is remarkable, that their criminals are not generally so hardened, nor their crimes so injurious to society, as those of the whites. Says the Editor of the N. Y. Evening Post—“In conversing with the chaplain of a prison, containing about 300 convicts, he remarked, that he found it much less difficult to get hold of the hearts and awaken the consciences of colored convicts, than of white men in the same situation.”

That the colored would not fall behind any part of our population in the duties of good citizenship, if not discouraged by prejudice, is proved sufficiently by what many have actually achieved in spite of their disadvantages. In Philadelphia, New-York, Boston, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, and other cities, are numerous colored citizens, possessed of wealth, which they are increasing by energetic and well-

The following is from an English paper. The subject of it is well known and highly esteemed in New-York, both as a preacher and a gentleman.

“There is at present in London an Episcopal clergyman—the Rev. Peter Williams of New-York, who, in consequence of his being a man of color, was refused by three lines of packets a passage to Europe. Mr. Williams is well known as a cultivated, pious, and estimable man. After having tried in vain to obtain a passage hither by the usual conveyance, he was compelled to embark from New-York on board an English vessel, the captain of which treated him with distinguished kindness and attention. Mr. Williams has recently made the attempt to return from London to the United States by the American packets, but has been refused a passage, except on conditions that it would be a degradation to him to accept. He will again have to be indebted to an English vessel, which will sail in about ten days, for the means of reaching his native land.”

“From the letter of Rev. Theodore S. Wright, to Dr. Alexander:—

“You, no doubt, sir, recollect that, on Tuesday the 20th of last month, the “Literary Society of the Alumni of Nassau Hall,” convened at the chapel of the Seminary for the purpose of hearing their annual address. Desirous of partaking of the intellectual repast which was very justly anticipated, I was induced to attend. Accordingly, when the time arrived for the exercises to commence, I repaired to the place of meeting. I found the chapel crowded to overflowing. I was favored to stand inside by the door. After occupying that position some time, benches were passed in, and placed in one of the aisles. Like those near me, I availed myself of a seat on one of those benches, perhaps ten feet from the door. There I sat until the close of the exercises. The band had played; the President had announced the appointments for the evening, and the audience had arisen to withdraw, when I heard with surprise the ungentlemanly outcry, “Out with the nigger!” “Out with the nigger!” But I had not the least idea that I was the victim, until seized by the collar by a young man *who kicked me two or three times in the most ruthless manner*—at the same time saying, “What do you do here? what do you do here? Don’t let me see you here again.” Just at this instant, an individual, who I am informed is a member of the Seminary, laid hold of the infatuated young man, and prevented his farther abuse. With an air of conscious self-importance, he exclaimed, as if he had effected some noble exploit, “My name is Ancrum—my name is Ancrum.”

directed industry. In Philadelphia, the real estate owned by colored men is supposed to be worth at least one million of dollars. From a memorial carefully drawn up by the colored people of Philadelphia, and presented to the legislature of Pennsylvania in 1832, we gather the following facts:—In the year 1830, it appears that out of 549 out-door poor, relieved during the year, only 22 were persons of color, being about 4 per cent. of the whole number, while their ratio of population exceeds 8 1-4 per cent. The colored paupers admitted into the Alms House for the same period, did not exceed 4 per cent. of the whole number. The amount of taxes paid by them could not be fairly ascertained; but, from imperfect returns, it appears that they pay not less than \$2,500 annually, while the sums expended for the relief of their poor, out of the public funds, has rarely, if ever, exceeded \$2000 a-year. The amount of rents paid by them is found to exceed 100,000 dollars annually.

The following facts, in regard to the colored people in New Bedford, (Mass.) speak triumphantly:—

The Brig Rising States, is owned by a company of colored men in New Bedford, and manned by an entire colored crew.

RICHARD JOHNSON, Agent.
EDWARD J. POMPEY, Master,
WILLIAM CUFFEE, Mate.
WILLIAM HAMBLETON, 2d Mate.

Said brig and outfits, cost five thousand five hundred dollars, and sailed from the port of New-Bedford to the South Atlantic Ocean, on a voyage of twelve months. The whole number of officers and men is fifteen. There are now in this vicinity, two captains, laid up in ordinary for want of employ, owing to the prejudice which exists against people of color, and we have not the means ourselves to purchase and fit ships for those amongst us who are qualified to take charge of them. There are two men now at sea, who are fully qualified for masters of vessels, and first rate whale men, but are obliged to serve as common sailors because of their color only.

There are in New Bedford, about twelve hundred colored inhabitants, of which number there are fifty owning real estate, valued at seventy thousand dollars."

Let it be remembered that our main reliance for spreading our doctrines, and keeping them to the conscience till the desired effect is produced, is the PRESS. The PRESS MUST BE KEPT FREE AND ACTIVE. It had been already discerned, and it was clearly apprehended by the founders of our admirable form of government, that neither the form they selected, nor any other, could of itself secure the freedom of the people. Their hope was in THE FREEEOM OF THE PRESS—the Press throwing sunlight into every

dwelling from the mansion of the President to the log cabin of the frontier—the press, telling in every ear the sufferings of the lowest, and the crimes of the highest—leaving no concealment for wrong, nor ambuscade for guile—pouring full upon every public servant, the focus of the public gaze, and blasting tyranny and oppression in the bud. The freedom of the press is the only hope of the weak against the strong, of the honest against the crafty. That which cuts off its benefit from the humblest individual in the land,—call it, as the slaveholders do, a “domestic institution,” or what you will—is an abuse which ought to be swept away. Without this freedom of the press, paramount and supreme within the limits of truth, our democracy is but a name, our republic is but a many-headed tyrant. More true liberty may be enjoyed under a monarchy where the press is free, than in a republic where it is chained. Whether this assertion is borne out by examples across the water, we will not stop to decide, but of this our warfare has assured us, that the freedom of the press is yet to be established here, and that freedom of thought is even more shackled with us than freedom of motion—bodily slavery being confined to the South, while mental slavery is co-extensive with the land.

It is true that the freedom of the press is most emphatically guarded both by our Federal and State Constitutions, and it is true that on many subjects it is free. On many wrongs confined to the few, and on many abstract crimes, its light falls freely,—but there is one great practical wrong,—a crime that smells to heaven—a crime which has clothed itself in the blackness of the pit, upon which it has not been permitted to shine. Public opinion, giving license to mobs, has cried, Hands off. It has been accounted a piece of extreme presumption in this Society, and the pioneers who led to its formation, to have turned the focus of the press upon the subject of slavery. It is spoken of as rashness, recklessness, madness. What does this accusation on millions of tongues, from the sages of the surplice and the ermine, to the babblers of the grog shops—imply? What does it *imply*? Nay, what does it proclaim aloud and unceasingly as with the voice of a raging ocean? It proclaims that the guarantee of the Constitution is held as a nullity—that the war of a free press is yet to be waged.

We conjure abolitionists to use the press while they may, and so to use it, that the bands which would bind it shall

'fall asunder like tow at the touch of fire'—so use it that tyrants, and makers of gag-laws, great and small, shall be glad to sell their power for as much respectability as it will fetch.

POLITICAL ACTION.

It is contended by some that abolitionists ought to abstain from all political action, and that their cause will be ruined from the moment of its taking a political aspect. Some who claim to be friends of the slave devote themselves, and would have others, exclusively to an appeal to the religious feelings; and as the number of professedly religious men is comparatively small, they sometimes go a step farther back, and suppose that nothing effectual can be done till the mass of men are made speculatively and professedly religious. Thus they step out of the cause, into the work of producing an abstract religion, a sort of quintessence of humanity, which they bottle up as they go along, to be used when there is enough of it to flood the land. But our immediatism has led us to appeal to that religion which will go immediately to work, and which will work by all lawful and right means, trusting that it will enlarge and deepen itself by its own action. The religion we appeal to, is no more out of place in politics than salt is in the ocean. As the bands, which we call in the aid of religion to sunder, were politically created, and are politically sustained, they can only be politically broken. What needs to be done, is, to excite a sympathy for the oppressed which shall make itself felt through the law-making, and the law-executing powers. But the opinions and feelings of the people will not be felt in their legislatures till some effort is made to carry them there. The prostrate cause of bleeding humanity will never rise in our courts of justice, till there are powerful advocates to plead it. That sympathy for the oppressed which does not, from the instant of its birth, operate to reform and purify the abused and perverted law, is thrown away—for if it expends itself in relieving individual cases, it does but prune the tree of oppression that it may strike its roots the deeper in the soil. Political action there must be. Law must be brought back from its unnatural alliance with despotism, before freedom can be established. That religion

which makes a man shrink from his political responsibilities when the foundation principles of justice are to be brought to their position in the structure of human society—when the liberties of millions are at stake, will not, we are constrained to believe, prove a support to the soul when God shall ask, Where is thy brother?

But there is a sort of political action which is greatly to be deprecated. It is the political action of base and selfish men rising into power by the generalship of a party. Political hypocrisy is so common, and has been, time out of mind, that it seems to form the rule, and honesty the exception. It is to be expected that some political wolves will put on the clothing of abolitionism, and seek to elevate themselves and manage the Anti-Slavery organization to secure their own purposes. But they ought to be met on the threshold, and stripped of their disguise. The best safeguard against their entrance is for abolitionists, while they firmly refuse to vote for a man who will not support abolition measures, to avoid setting up candidates of their own. Let every abolitionist follow the leading of his own political principles so long as he can do it without sacrificing the paramount claims of the slave. The fashion with a political party is, to inquire, not whether a candidate is himself true to the *principles* of the party, but whether he is true to some other *man*, whom the party is pledged either to support or oppose. Let it be understood that so far as we act politically, it is only to carry a political measure, and that in doing this we have no preference to employ the men, who have been most active and successful in the moral struggle with the people. These men, be it known to the world, have not faced all manner of obloquy and violence for any reward of honor or office, which the people have to give. While that abolitionist is unworthy of the name who cares a straw for the victory of one or the other political party compared with the abolition of slavery, still less is he worthy of it, who wears it with any other wish than to gain the blessed sight of sundered chains and broken yokes—and to hear the loud acclaim of a North American Jubilee.

Keeping clear of the false or uncertain lights of political leaders, let us follow the pole star of our holy principle, and do all that Christians and freemen can, for those whose oppression has been the sin of our fathers, and is our sin and

shame, from one end of the land to the other. Let us make thorough work of political action.

The disfranchisement of our coloured population to which, we have already referred, is a political wrong which must be attacked politically, and agitated politically till it is politically overthrown. Let the abolitionists in every state petition their own legislature to do justice in this matter by blotting out the laws which attach degradation to color, and withhold the premiums which allure men to virtue. Economy in courts, constables, jails and penitentiaries should of itself long since have taught them to do this.

Upwards of 100,000 persons petitioned the last Congress for the immediate abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. How their prayer was spurned, we have already seen. But the District of Columbia is not less under the control of Congress, than it was before. The abolition of slavery, the liberation of 26,000 persons, and the creation of a free atmosphere around the sanctuary of our country's liberties, is not less important than it was before. And it is sufficiently important, apart from its relation to the question of slavery in the States, to justify, ten times, nay a thousand times the effort that has ever been made for its accomplishment. It is sufficiently important to demand the attention of Congress, in precedence of any other subject which ever has, or ever can come before it. What is the making or mending of the currency, even supposing Congress clothed with the miraculous power of paying the people's debts by a flourish of pens, compared with the question, whether this nation, as a nation, in the sight of the world, shall go for the principle of *property in man*, or against it? What can wealth do to exalt a nation, compared with righteousness? It may be said that the temper of Congress, and the position of the President, render the effort hopeless. Were we to grant this, present effort would still be immeasurably important, as the ground of future success. In the District of Columbia, we have clear constitutional ground. If we abandon it for once, how are we ever to regain it? If then, 100,000 names have failed, let us send 500,000. Let us, year by year, send up increasing floods of petitions, till our object is gained, or a satisfactory reason is given for refusing it.

The Constitution of the United States, ordains that—

"No person held to service, or labor, in one state, under the laws thereof, esca-

ping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor; but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

We have certainly a right to construe an instrument made for the purpose of "establishing justice," which the Constitution of the United States professes to be, as much in accordance with justice, as the language of its provisions will possibly allow. What right have we to take it for granted, that in any of these republican states, a person may be held to service or labor, "under the laws thereof," except as the result of a contract, or of a "due process of law," enjoining the service or labor, as an equivalent for *value received*. Any other supposition, would attribute to the particular state, conduct, not only unjust but unconstitutional. On the natural construction of the language, the Constitution simply forbids the state to discharge the fugitive party from a certain obligation legally incurred in another state, and enjoins his delivery on the claim of the party to whom he is *indebted*. There is nothing in the language to distinguish the claim from an ordinary one of debt. If, then, the Constitution had forbidden the several states to discharge a debtor, escaping from one state into another, and had enjoined each state to compel the payment of the debt, on claim of the party to whom it was *due*, where and how would the claim have been adjudicated? Certainly it must have been adjudicated in the jurisdiction where the debtor should be found residing, for the burden of proof lies upon the claimant. And it would have been necessary for the claimant to establish, before a jury, a fair bargain of quid pro quo, under and according to the laws of the state in which it was made, as well as the identity of the debtor. Hence manifestly the claimant in the case of a fugitive from service or labor, has no remedy under the Constitution, unless he can establish before a jury the *indebtedness* of the party claimed to have been holden to service or labor, in any state, under the laws thereof. It is not sufficient for him to prove that the laws of his state permit *slavery*. Slavery is unknown to the Constitution, which declares that no person "shall be deprived of liberty without due process of law."

But in practice, a very different construction has been put upon this clause of the Constitution. By the act of Congress of 1793, in relation to fugitives, &c., a citizen of one state may claim a citizen of another state as his slave, may

select his own magistrate, and having proved to the satisfaction of that magistrate, that the person so claimed is his *slave*, without offering any proof of legal indebtedness, shall have a certificate to remove him into slavery in the state from which he is claimed to have escaped. It is plain, that this law leaves the liberty of the colored citizen, especially, most unrighteously exposed. He is left at the mercy of a single judge, not of his own choosing, without any compulsory power of summoning witnesses. By high authorities this law has been declared to be unconstitutional. It is certainly most unrighteous, and ought to be repealed. Its repeal should be petitioned for, and in the mean time, its validity should be tested, if opportunity should offer, before our judicial tribunals.

The noble example of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in permitting an arrest of the summary process, by a resort to a jury, is worthy to encourage abolitionists to petition for like justice from each of the free States.

Another point on which the most strenuous political action is demanded, is the confinement of slavery within its present limits. The recognition of Texan independence is doubtless but a stepping-stone to its admission into the Union as a brood of slave states. It was slaveholding cupidity that planted in Texas the standard of revolt; and the re-establishment of slavery, abolished by Mexico throughout her entire territory, was the object. The determination of the South to introduce Texas into the Union, is but too apparent. The delay and pretended hesitation have only been resorted to to gain time and get the more smoothly over northern scruples of conscience. There will not be wanting northern men who will sell themselves to the interests of southern oppression in this, as they have done in all other cases, where a price was offered. Says Gen. Houston, in a letter to Gen. R. G. Dunlap, of Tennessee, dated July 3, 1836—

"There is but one feeling in Texas, in my opinion, and that is to establish the independence of Texas, AND TO BE ATTACHED TO THE UNITED STATES."

At a Texas meeting held in the city of New-York on the 18th of August, 1836, at which Samuel Swartwout, Esq. presided, and Gov. Hamilton, and Senator Preston of South Carolina, and the Hon. Cornelius W. Lawrence, Mayor of the city of New-York, were among the guests, the follow-

ing toast was proposed by the HON. RICHARD RIKER, Recorder of the city:—

"May the citizens of Texas remember their father land, and speedily engraft their country on the parent stock."

The Charleston Mercury gives the following account of the language used by Hon. John C. Calhoun, at a public dinner in that city, since the rising of Congress:—

"He spoke of Texas, and at that name was interrupted with long and loud cheering; and his concluding words on that topic, pronounced with deep emotion, that 'Texas must be annexed to the Union,' were answered with a universal burst of applause, that showed how glowing was the sympathy of the people of South Carolina with the heroes of San Jacinto. He pointed out clearly the importance to the South of the annexation, &c."

It remains to be seen, whether there is Christianity, honor, or honesty enough in the United States, to prevent her from overrunning Mexico with her states and her slaves.

Another object of importance, to be accomplished by political action, is the support of freedom and the discountenance of slavery in our foreign relations. With one remarkable exception, it has been our national policy to recognize the independence of every nation which has been able to establish and maintain independence, *de facto*. The right or wrong of the contest has not been inquired into. It was enough for us to know that a people were independent, and resolved to remain so. On this principle, the independence of Texas was recognized at the close of the last session of Congress. The exception we have made in relation to one people, rests on no graver reason than the color of their skin. Hayti, once called St. Domingo, was involved with France in her bloody revolution. Her half million of slaves profited by the lessons taught them by a handfull of pale faces, and rose in rebellion on the 15th of August, 1791. At the request of the French ministers, like true brother slaveholders, we helped the masters to arms and money from the national chest. The slaves at length gained their freedom—not by arms, but by the act of the French Republic. They enjoyed it worthily till 1801, when Buonaparte, finding leisure from the deeper game of European conquest, sent 60,000 of his choicest veterans to reimpose the yoke. But neither their swords nor their more dangerous cunning and perfidy availed. Eighteen months swept them into their inglorious graves, and Hayti was free. Under her own chieftains, she resumed the arts of peace; and so much did her commerce prosper, that its

destruction was thought a matter of importance by the French Emperor, then in the zenith of his power. Unwilling again to risk his troops or his laurels in a war of blood, he resorted with his characteristic energy to a war of starvation! In this honorable business, he found a willing partner in our slaveholding government. An act of Congress was passed in 1806, prohibiting, under forfeiture of vessel and cargo, all commerce with independent Hayti. After a year's trial of this noble and magnanimous warfare, the high belligerent parties—Imperial France, and the Republican United States—had the gratification to find that their mighty effort had had the effect only to throw the commerce of Hayti into the hands of Great Britain! The hero of Italy made his retreat without the sound of trumpet, and the Act of Congress went to its tomb with a private funeral. We presume this piece of liberalism has never been recorded among the glories of our country, and never will be. Since that time, we have enjoyed commerce with Hayti on as favorable terms as any other nation; and if it has not been at all times as safe as it might be, we have, as will presently appear, not much cause for complaint. But before any further remark upon our own relations to Hayti, let us sketch the history of her negotiations with France. Hayti, at first, fell under the leadership of rival chieftains, and France long cherished the hope of profiting by their dissensions. But she hoped in vain. On the restoration of the Bourbons, the French sought Haytian commerce, and were admitted under a masked flag. It was the policy of Hayti to open her ports freely to all who sought them. In 1814, Dauxion Lavaysse was sent to Hayti by the French, with the offer of a treaty; and his proposition was nothing less than that Hayti should acknowledge *the sovereignty of France*. This insult was resented with so much spirit, that the French king thought it politic to disavow an agent who bore instructions under the undeniable signature of his own minister! Two years after, France contented herself with merely asking what she called a *constitutional sovereignty*. In 1821, she reduced her demand to a simple *suzerainte*, or right of *protection*, like that exercised by the British over the Ionian islands. But to all these claims of the right of dominion or protectorship, Hayti returned but one decided NO. In 1823, France waived all other claims, and descended to the negotiation of an *indemnity*; but in

1824, she returned to her claim of the "*exterior sovereignty*," or the control of Haytian commerce, which she was graciously pleased to say to the Haytians, would be, and was only designed to be, *for their own good!* But in the mean time, step by step, Hayti had become consolidated under one republican government, and there was no longer any hope to France that she could recover her lost colony by arms or artifice: it was time, therefore, to make the most of the indemnity in behalf of the French planters, which the Haytian government had from the first offered to pay. For some commercial advantages, and an indemnity of 150,000,000 francs, payable in five yearly instalments, it at last, in 1825, pleased "Charles the Tenth, by the grace of God, king of France and Navarre," to recognize Haytian Independence, by his royal ordonnance. Thus ended a negociation of eleven years, in which France wormed through all the mazes of diplomatic chicanery and perfidy, to subjugate a nation of men whom she despised as stupid, and hated as rebellious slaves, at the same time that she feared to meet them in battle. On the other hand, Hayti stood erect, neither deluded by artifice, wearied out by importunity, nor awed by threats. As to the payment of the indemnity, we have no information but the following passage from a geographical work, published in Paris in 1835. "It is well known, that the chambers of this republic voted the sum of 150,000,000 francs, to indemnify, so far as practicable, the ancient French colonists. *The last instalment has been paid in 1835.* This is a rare example of the kind, and worthy of record."* Although the payment of this large indemnity by a nation of lately emancipated negroes is almost too much to be believed, even without prejudice, we are at a loss to account for such a statement in a geographical work, and equally so to account for the friendliness of France, except by supposing some arrangement by which the indemnity is effectually secured.

But to return to our own country: although we have a commerce with Hayti about equal to that with Russia; and though there are many nations in Europe at whose courts we support expensive missions with which we have far

* On sait que les chambres de cette république ont voté cent cinquante millions pour indemniser, autant qu'il était possible, les anciens colons français. Le dernier dividende a été payé en 1835. C'est un exemple rare en pareil cas, et bon citer.—*L'Amérique, &c. Paris, 1835.*

less commerce, yet we have never recognized the independence of Hayti. On every ground worthy of regard, this is a disgrace to our national character. It gives the lie to all our professions of friendship for human liberty. It will pass down to coming generations as a stain upon our memory. It is time that those who feel any responsibility or have any regard for their country's good name—to say nothing of philanthropy—should bring this matter to the notice of Congress. Let us at least know the reasons why a horde of piratical land agents are to be met on their return from a successful skirmish, and welcomed with all due pomp and form to the platform of nations, while a people who have thrown off a foreign yoke for the best of all reasons, and not only fairly won, but with dignity maintained their independence for thirty-five years, and with whom the commercial interests of our citizens are involved to the amount of two or three millions of dollars per annum, should be utterly neglected—not even recognized by the residence of a consul?

But, not to rest altogether on the higher feelings of our nature, have not some of our citizens reasons of a pecuniary kind to induce them to seek the recognition of Haytian independence? What is it that protects our commerce with Hayti? what, but an honesty on their part, for which we offer but the slightest inducements? Let the following facts testify how much at the mercy of Hayti our complaisance to slaveholders places our fellow-citizens who are engaged in Haytian commerce. King Henry Christophe, as part and parcel of his royalty, seized certain vessels from the United States with their cargoes, and put the proceeds into his royal treasury. The owners of these vessels have since been claimants for indemnity; and while in similar circumstances, indemnity has been recovered for our citizens from the governments of France, Spain, Naples, Sweden, Denmark, Portugal, and Russia, they have been left to manage for themselves. At sundry times these merchants have urged their claims by *special agents*—first, upon King Christophe himself, and since his downfall, upon President Boyer, under whom the whole government was consolidated. King Christophe, it is believed, had the shrewdness to entrench himself behind his royal dignity: he would not treat with the agents because his sovereignty had not been recognized. President Boyer, also, through his able secre-

tary, Inginac, politely informed the agents that he could not treat with them till they were furnished with *regular credentials*, which must of course *recognize* the independence of the government with which they were to treat! What blame our statesmen can attach to these "negroes" for their troublesome scrupulosity about forms and national etiquette, we do not pretend to know; nor do we know whether or not the claims of these merchants have been hushed by men in power, lest they should give "*color to the idea*" on the floor of Congress, that a nation of negroes can take care of themselves. We are not informed whether they have asked Congress or the President to recognize Haytian independence in favor of their claims, or whether they have pocketed their loss in silent dignity. But the facts serve to show how cheerfully we can make ourselves contemptible for the support of our darling national sin.

In closing, the Committee would merely say that they feel constrained, both by the experience of the past and the prospects of the future, to press forward. They throw themselves with renewed confidence upon the holy principles of this precious cause. In advocating these principles, they stand not only upon the safe foundation of the law of God, but fully upon the Constitution of their country. In demanding that slavery shall immediately cease, both in law and fact, in the general and the particular, they neither transcend their own rights, nor seek to impose upon others a wrong. Whether their demand shall be acceded to, they leave to God, well assured that their labor has not been and will not be in vain, inasmuch as liberty is the common cause of human kind; and all we enjoy we owe to the possession of that freedom which we seek for all.

By order of the Executive Committee,

ELIZUR WRIGHT, JR.

Sec. of Dom. Cor.

New - York, May 8th, 1837.

WAS SLAVERY FORCED UPON THE SOUTH?

We cannot disguise the pleasure we feel at being able to enrich our present number with the following letter from Dr. John Farmer, the historian of New-Hampshire.

CONCORD, N. H., 4th May, 1837.

My dear Sir—How often do we hear it asserted that Slavery was forced upon the South by Great Britain, contrary to their wishes and remonstrances? Even some of the publications of the Colonization Society have given currency to this idea, and have declared that slaves were early “introduced in great numbers by the English, but not without the *serious remonstrances* of the Colonists.” Notwithstanding the southern members of the convention which adopted the United States’ Constitution insisted, at the formation of the national “compact,” that no restriction should be put upon the importation of slaves for the succeeding TWENTY YEARS, this assertion is believed by a great portion of the community. But how are the facts in the case? I have not the means of examining them in regard to the oldest colonies; but, with your indulgence, I will give you from authentic sources some particulars in reference to one of them, and leave it to you to make such comments as you deem proper. I will select the state of Georgia. This was the last of the original thirteen that was settled. The charter of the colony was granted by George II., on the 9th of June, in the fifth year of his reign. It was settled in 1733. Gen. James Oglethorpe conducted the first transportation of settlers, which consisted of forty families, making one hundred persons, who arrived in Georgia on the 1st of February, 1733. The establishment and settlement of the colony was entrusted to a corporation, consisting of twenty-one persons, called Trustees, who were vested with the powers of legislation twenty-one years.

It was the intention of those concerned in the settlement to prevent the introduction of slavery; and the Trustees, among the first rules and orders for the regulation of the plantation, absolutely forbid the use of negroes as slaves. In “An Account, shewing the Progress of the Colony of Georgia in America, from its First Establishment,” pub-

lished at London in 1741, and reprinted at Annapolis, in Maryland, by Jonas Green, in 1742, the Trustees give their reasons for *keeping slavery out of the colony*, which I will transcribe at length:—

“The Trustees were induced to prohibit the use of Negroes within *Georgia*, the Intention of his Majesty’s Charter being to provide for poor People incapable of subsisting themselves at Home, and to settle a Frontier to *South Carolina*, which was much exposed by the small number of its white Inhabitants. It was impossible that the Poor who should be sent from hence, and the Foreign Persecuted Protestants, who must go in a manner Naked into the Colony, could be able to purchase or subsist them, if they had them, and it would be a Charge too great for the Trustees to undertake; and they would be thereby disabled from sending white People. The first Cost of a Negro is about *Thirty Pounds*; and this *Thirty Pounds* would pay the Passage over, provide Tools and other Necessaries, and defray the charge of Subsistence of a white Man for a Year, in which time it might be hoped that the Planter’s own Labour would grant him some Subsistence; consequently, the Purchase Money of every Negro (abstracting the Expence of subsisting him, as well as his Master,) by being applied that way would prevent the sending over a white Man who would be a Security to the Province, whereas the Negro would render that Security precarious.

“It was thought the white Man, by having a Negro Slave, would be less disposed to Labour himself, and that his whole Time must be employed in keeping the Negro to Work, and in watching against any Danger he or his Family might apprehend from the Slave, and that the Planter’s Wife and Children would by the Death, or even the Absence of the Planter, be at the Mercy of the Negro.

“It was also apprehended, that the *Spaniards* at *St. Augustine* would be continually enticing away the Negroes, or encouraging them to Insurrection. That the first might easily be accomplished, since a single Negro would run away thither without Companions, and would have only a River or two to swim over, and this Opinion has been confirmed and justified by the practices of the *Spaniards* even in times of profound Peace amongst the Negroes in *South Carolina*, where though at a greater Distance from *St.*

Augustine, some have fled in *Periaguas* and little Boats to the *Spaniards*, and been protected, and others in large Bodies have been incited to Insurrections, to the great Terror and even endangering the Loss of that Province, which though it has been established above seventy Years, has scarce white People enough to secure her own Slaves.

“It was also considered that the Produces designed to be raised in the Colony, would not require such Labour as to make Negroes necessary for carrying them on; for the Province of *Carolina* produces chiefly Rice, which is a Work of Hardship proper for Negroes; whereas the Silk and other Produces which the Trustees proposed to have the People employed on in *Georgia*, were such as Women and Children might be of as much Use as the Negroes.

“It was likewise apprehended, that the Persons who should go over to *Georgia* at their own Expence, should be permitted the use of Negroes, it would dispirit and ruin the poor Planters, who could not get them, and who by their Numbers were designed to be the Strength of the Province; it would make them clamorous to have Negroes given them, and on the Refusal would drive them from the Province, or at least make them negligent of their Plantations, where they would be unwilling, nay, would certainly disdain, to work like Negroes; and would rather let themselves out to wealthy Planters, as Overseers of their Negroes.

“It was further thought, that upon the Admission of Negroes, the wealthy Planters would, as in all other Colonies, be more induced to absent themselves and live in other Places, leaving the Care of their Plantations and Negroes to Overseers.

“It was likewise thought, that the poor Planter sent on Charity, from his desire to have Negroes as well as the Planter who should settle at his own Expence, would (if he had leave to alienate) mortgage his Land to the Negro Merchant for them, or at least become a Debtor for the Purchase of such Negroes; and under these Weights and Discouragements would be induced to sell his Slaves again upon any Necessity, and would leave the Province and his Lot to the Negro Merchant: In Consequence of which, all the small Properties would be swallowed up, as they have been at other Places, by the more wealthy Planters.

“It was likewise considered, that the admitting of Negroes

in *Georgia* would naturally facilitate the Desertion of the *Carolina* Negroes, through the Province of *Georgia*, and consequently this Colony, instead of proving a Frontier and adding Strength to the Province of *South Carolina*, would be a Means of drawing off the Slaves of *Carolina*, and adding thereby a Strength to *Augustine*.

“From these several Considerations, as the Produces to be raised in the Colony did not make Negro Slaves necessary, as the introduction of them so near to a Garrison of the *Spaniards* would weaken rather than strengthen the Barrier, and as they would introduce with them a greater Propensity to Idleness among the poor Planters, and too great an Inequality among the People, it was thought proper to make the *Prohibition of them a Fundamental of the Constitution*.”

These reasons, one would think, were sufficient to satisfy the Colonists that on the score of policy and interest, the exclusion of slavery was demanded. But they did not satisfy the Georgians. From “A True and Historical Narrative of the Colony of Georgia, in America, from the first settlement thereof until this present period,” &c. By PATRICK TAILFER, M. D., HUGH ANDERSON, M. A., DA. DOUGLAS, and others, Landholders in Georgia, printed at Charles Town, South Carolina in 1741, I find it stated that in the summer of 1735, a little more than two years after the settlement commenced, a petition, “signed by about seventeen of the better sort of people in Savannah,” was presented to the Trustees “FOR THE USE OF NEGROES.” In this petition, “there was set forth the great disproportion betwixt the maintenance and clothing of white servants and negroes.” This petition was carried to England, and presented to the Trustees, by Mr. Hugh Stirling, an experienced planter in the Colony; but, as the writers of this work state, “no regard was had to it, and great resentment was even shewn to Mr. Thompson, the Master of the vessel in which it went.”

This appears to have been the first formal application of the inhabitants of Georgia for the privilege of having slavery entailed upon them. But the Trustees firmly adhered to the rules they had established. Two years afterwards, there was a Representation of the *grievances, hardships and necessities* of the colony made by the Grand

Jury of Savannah to the Trustees, in which the subject of "the great want of servants," was a prominent one. For the want of them, they were rendered "incapable of proceeding with proper vigor in cultivating their lands." This was signed by forty-four persons and sent home, and though many of their grievances might have been redressed by the Trustees, no encouragement was given that they would be allowed the use of coloured servants. At this time, (1737,) JOHN WESLEY, was in Savannah, who being opposed to the admission of slaves into the colony, was regarded with jealousy and distrust. Those who were so anxious for power to enslave their species, and to exercise their tyranny over the coloured man, could thus speak of this devoted friend of liberty and human rights: "Now to make our subjection the more compleat, a new kind of tyranny was this summer begun to be imposed upon us; for Mr. *John Wesley* who had come over and was received by us as a clergyman of the *Church of England*, soon discovered that his aim was to enslave our *minds*, as a necessary preparative for enslaving our *bodies*. The attendances upon prayers, meetings and sermons inculcated by him, so frequently, and at improper hours, inconsistent with necessary labour, especially in an infant colony, tended to propagate a spirit of indolence, and of hypocrisy amongst the most abandoned; it being much easier for such persons, by an affected shew of religion, and adherence of Mr. Wesley's novelties, to be provided by his procurement from the public stores, than to use that industry which *true* religion recommends: Nor indeed could the reverend gentleman conceal the designs he was so full of, having frequently declared, *that he never desired to see Georgia a rich, but a religious colony.*"*

When General Oglethorpe visited the colony the third time, he is said to have declared in the court house in Savannah, "that as long as he had any thing to do with the colony, there should neither be allowance of negroes, nor alteration in the titles of land; and if any such thing should happen, he would have no further concern with it." Whether this declaration proceeded from that "strong benevolence of soul" ascribed to him by the poet, we are not informed. It did not, however, deter the people of Georgia from

* The words are thus italicised in the publication from which the extract is made.

their renewed applications for slaves. In December, 1738, one hundred and twenty-one persons of the province, of whom eighteen made their marks, subscribed a petition, which was sent to the trustees, in which they say, "The want of the use of negroes, with proper limitations, which if granted, would both occasion great numbers of white people to come here, and also render us capable to subsist ourselves, by raising provisions upon our lands, until we could make some produce fit for export, in some measure to balance our importation. We are very sensible of the inconveniences and mischiefs that have already, and do daily arise from an unlimited use of negroes; but we are sensible, that these may be prevented by a due limitation, such as so many to each white man, or so many to such a quantity of land, or in any other manner which your honours shall think most proper.

The trustees in their answer, dated 20th June, 1739, say, they "are fully convinced, that besides the hazard attending that *Introduction*, [of negroes,] it would destroy all industry among the white inhabitants; and that by giving them power to alien their lands, [for which they also petitioned,] the colony would soon be too like its neighbours, void of white inhabitants, filled with blacks, and reduced to the precarious property of a few, equally exposed to domestic treachery, and foreign invasion; and therefore the trustees cannot be supposed to be in any disposition of granting this request; and if they have not before signified their dislike of it, this delay is to be imputed to no other motives, but the hopes they had conceived, that time and experience would bring the complainants to a better mind: and the trustees readily join issue with them in their appeal to posterity, who shall judge between them, who were their best friends; *those*, who endeavoured to preserve for them a property in their lands, by tying up the hands of their unthrifty progenitors; or *they*, who wanted a power to mortgage or alien them: who were the best friends to the colony, *those* who with great labour and cost had endeavoured to form a colony of His Majesty's subjects, and persecuted *Protestants* from other parts of *Europe*, had placed them on a fruitful soil, and strove to secure them in their possessions, by those arts which naturally tend to keep the colony full of useful and industrious people, capable both to cultivate

and defend it ; or *those*, who, to gratify the greedy and ambitious views of a few negro merchants, would put into their power to become sole owners of the province, by introducing their baneful commodity ; which, it is well known by sad experience, has brought our neighbour colonies to the brink of ruin, by driving out their white inhabitants, who were their glory and strength, to make room for black, who are now become the terror of their unadvised masters."

The inhabitants still persisted in their demand for slaves. Some of the people of Savannah abandoned their settlements on Ogeechee river because they were "not allowed to have black servants to cultivate their lands, and because they disliked the tenure of the grants from the trustees," and they gave these reasons for so doing to the trustees in a letter dated 26th May, 1739. Mr. Martyn, the Secretary of the Board, thus replied to the first of their reasons for quitting their settlements, viz. because they were not allowed to have black servants, in a letter addressed to Messrs. Grant, Douglass and Bailee, at Savannah, dated 25th March, 1740. "As to the First, you must have seen by the Trustees Answer to the Representation of some of the People, that they cannot, and will not break into the Constitution of the province, by such an Introduction of Slavery in Blacks ; and that upon the most mature Deliberation, and for the strongest Reasons ; which indeed are obvious to every considering man, and which they are confirmed in by the Danger which has lately threatened *South Carolina*, by the Insurrection of the Negroes, and would be more imminent, in *Georgia*, it being a Frontier."

The people were not deterred by this strong and determined language from efforts to obtain the object of their wishes. Their importunities finally prevailed. The trustees being harassed with representations of their grievances, and wearied with their solicitations for rum, negroes, and a change in the tenure of their lands, and finding the colony to languish, at length resigned the charter into the hands of the king. This event occurred, 20th June, 1752. Dr. Holmes in noticing it in his annals of America, vol. 1, p. 45, thus speaks of the ordinances by which the people had been governed : "Their fundamental regulations, though *wholly formed on generous principles*, are pronounced to have been ill adapted to the situation and circumstances of the

poor settlers, and prejudicial to the prosperity of the province. By granting their small estates in tail male, they drove the settlers from Georgia to other parts of America, where they obtained lands on a larger scale, and on much better terms. By the prohibition of negroes, they rendered the subjugation of the thick forests, and the culture of the lands, very difficult if not impracticable."

To the last sentence the author of the annals has added the following note: "Such, though more positive, is the statement of [the Georgia,] historians. In relating facts without comment, we become not responsible for the *principles*, which they involve. It seems incumbent, however, to remark here, that there is one principle, which, neither in public nor private life, ought ever to be violated, whatever advantages may be expected to arise from its violation. Aristides furnishes a noble exemplification of this principle. Themistocles declaring, at a public assembly of the people, that he had formed a design which would be of great advantage to the state, but that, it was of such importance, it ought to be kept secret; he was ordered to communicate it to Aristides, to whose sole judgment it was referred. When Themistocles informed him, his project was to burn the whole Grecian navy, by which means the Athenians would become so powerful as to be the sovereigns of all Greece, Aristides, returning to the assembly, told the Athenians, 'that nothing could be more advantageous than the project of Themistocles, and that nothing could be more unjust.' Themistocles was ordered to desist from his design." Dr. Holmes had spent several years in Georgia, had seen the evils of slavery, and was prepared to say when he wrote his annals, more than thirty years since, that "NOTHING WAS MORE UNJUST," than to enslave human beings.

On the surrender of the charter, the people obtained what they had so long, and so ardently prayed for. Rum and negroes flowed in upon them in great abundance, and twenty years afterwards, they could number fourteen thousand slaves. My letter has been longer than I intended, it being my object when I sat down, to communicate a few facts contradictory to the oft repeated assertion that slavery was forced upon the South, against the *serious remonstrances* of the colonists. So far is this from being true with respect

to Georgia, that from the foregoing extracts and others in my possession, it appears that slavery was EXTORTED from the parent country against its *serious, solemn and often repeated remonstrances*.

I am, dear Sir, your friend and laborer,

JOHN FARMER.

PROF. WRIGHT, New-York.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

"POEMS, written during the progress of the ABOLITION QUESTION in the United States, between the years 1830 and 1838. By JOHN G. WHITTIER. Boston, Isaac Knapp, 1837."

A warrior is nothing without a bard. Great deeds are made chiefly in the singing. And it is the singing of some great deeds which, more than any thing else, excites to others. The obligations of the Anti-Slavery cause in America to the pioneer spirit of Garrison are most gratefully acknowledged by all true and intelligent abolitionists. But what the same cause and Garrison himself owe to Whittier is not perhaps so generally recognized. John G. Whittier was among the first men to hail the noble undertaking of Garrison and Knapp, and he did it to good purpose. While other more *prudent* men were standing agape at the presumption of a mere printer rebuking a whole nation, *composing-stick* in hand, and without the fear of jails and gibbets before his eyes, Whittier grasped him by the hand and cheered him with the ardor of a brother. With as good a hold on the bubble reputation as almost any American poet, he was not ashamed, or afraid to address the reviled William Lloyd Garrison in such strains as these :

"Go on!—for thou hast chosen well;
On in the strength of God!
Long as one human heart shall swell
Beneath the tyrants' rod,
Speak in a slumbering nation's ear,
As thou hast ever spoken,
Until the dead in sin shall hear—
'The fetter's link be broken!

I love thee with a brother's love,
I feel my pulses thrill,
To mark thy spirit soar above
The cloud of human ill.
My heart hath leaped to answer thine,
And echo back thy words,
As leaps the warrior's at the shine
And flash of kindred swords."

Who can estimate the impulsive force of such words upon a susceptible heart, girding itself to a great and difficult enterprise? And who can over-

rate the power of the following lines, as a shield to quench the fiery darts of calumny?

"Have I not known thee well, and read
Thy mighty purpose long!
And watched the trials which have made
Thy human spirit strong?
And shall the *slanderer's demon breath*
Avail with one like me,
To dim the *sunshine of my faith*,
And earnest trust in thee?"

This noble stand of the "Quaker poet" we have good reason to affirm, did wonders in breaking the brazen and serried ranks of prejudice which opposed the good cause at its outset. And this little volume shows that he has not been idle since, but has seized the most important occasions of dealing death-blows to the champions of brutal bondage. Such poetry it is that the true patriot and Christian delights to honor. It is not the idle pillar, festooned for the show of an occasion, but the substantial, solid, well proportioned actual supporter of the imperishable temple of human rights.

"*SOCIETY IN AMERICA*, by HARRIET MARTINEAU, *author of Illustrations of Political Economy*. 2 vol. 12mo. New-York, Saunders & Otley, 1837."

Miss Martineau is a wise woman, both positively and comparatively. Nor would her comparative wisdom be diminished by a change of sex. It is fortunate for the present work, that her character was fully established, before she set about it. Patient and thorough in thought, close jointed in logic, energetic in style, radical in her political opinions, and fearless in the expression of them, she had long furnished to the conservative reviewers of her own country one of their most unsatisfactory subjects. With us, like liberty in the abstract, she was unreservedly popular, from Maine to Florida. Her advent to our shores was hailed with universal delight, as that of the most truly American of all the English, and the wounded sensibilities of our great vulgar looked to her unprejudiced lips for a salve that should cicatrize the graceless excoriations of Mrs. Trollope. But she had no such object. She came to use the probe and the knife, and she has done it like a skillful and humane surgeon. What she has found among us reasonably sound and healthful, she has not failed to commend, and her censure will be received by the thinking and truly patriotic of our countrymen, not only as giving additional value to her commendation, but as more valuable in itself from the justness of its application and the mercifulness of its temper. We refer especially to her remarks on American Slavery. With the best opportunity in the world to see the *best side* of slavery, and every motive to make the best of that, she has exposed the sin with a power of rebuke that will mightily advance the cause of freedom. Well may we forgive all the wrongs we have suffered from the pens of foreign quack-travellers, in consideration of the benefits of Harriet Martineau's faithful and honorable plain-dealing.

INDEX.

A.

ABDY's travels, 374.
 Abolition, a religious enterprise, 133.
 Abolitionists, Appropriate work of, 113.
 Adams, Hon. John Quincy, 344, 413.
 Agents, 348.
 Amalgamation, 409.
 Annexation of Texas, 434.
 Apprenticeship, 240, 243.
 " British, 341.
 Archy Moore, 344.
 Association, Baptist, 103.
 " of French Creek, 357.
 " Hancock, 359.
 " of Holland Purchase, 357.
 " of New-York, 356.
 " Stonington Union, 358.
 " Union Baptist, 357.
 " Washington, 359.
 " of western N.Y., 357.
 " of Worcester, 356.
 Associations of Connecticut and Massachusetts, 49, 388.
 Atlee, Edwin P., 347.
 Auxiliary Societies, 347.
 Avery, William, 408.

B.

Balbi's School Geography, 351.
 Ball, Charles, 344.
 Baptists of Charleston, 103.
 " of England, 91, 354.
 Baxter, Rev. Dr., 116.
 Beaumont, Gustavus de, 175.
 Benson, George, 347.
 Bible Argument, 115, 219, 238.
 Biblical Repertory, 115, 219.
 Booth, Abraham, 97.
 Boyer, President, 437.
 Branding slaves, 407.
 Breckinridge, Rev. R. J., 353.

Brig, Rising States, 427.
 Broken vow, 218.
 Burning men in Arkansas, 408.
 "Buying with money," 254.

C.

Calhoun, Hon. J. C., 71, 210, 434.
 Canaan, Curse of, 296.
 Capers, Rev. Dr., 387.
 Caste, Anecdote of, 18.
 " in the U. S., 175.
 Chapman, Miss Ann Greene, 347.
 Chapter of Abominations, 406.
 Charleston, Baptist Association of, 103.
 " Slave Shambles in, 364.
 Children, Agent for, 351.
 Christophe, king Henry, 437.
 Church carried along, 41.
 Cincinnati, Mob in, 398.
 " Synod of, 356.
 Clarkson, Matthew, 19.
 Clinton Resolutions, 387.
 Colored people in Ohio, 349.
 " " in Philadelphia, 20.
 " " of the U. S., 11.
 " " in Upper Canada, 350.

Commercial crisis, 366.
 Cone, Rev. S. H., 100.
 Consequences, calculation of, 46.
 Constitution, in relation to slavery, 73, 145, 226.
 Cotton trade, 369.
 Cowles, Rev. Henry, 133.
 Cox, Rev. F. A., 90.
 Crothers, Rev. Samuel, 115, 219.
 Cruelty, Cases of, 406.

D.

Dawes, Mr., 83.
 Dean, Trial of Albe, 110.
 Death for striking, 407.

Definition of slavery, 239.
 Diversities of men, 199.
 Dogging men, 405, 409.
 Domestic affairs, 216, 343.
 " slave trade, 208, 409.
 Dumbarton, 355.
 Dunlap, Hon. R. G., 350.
 Dunn, John H. Esq., 351.

E.

Ecclesiastical approbation, 356.
 Egyptian bondage, 291.
 Ely, Rev. E. S. D.D., 396.

F.

Farmer, Dr. John, 432.
 Fleming, Mr. James, 409.
 Flogging to death, 406.
 Follen, Dr. Charles, 61.
 Folly of great men, 217.
 Foreign intelligence, 213, 341.
 "Forever," signification of, 308.
 Fourth Annual Report, 347.
 Franklin, Benjamin, 229.
 Freedom, Cause of, 61.
 French Abolition Society, 213.
 Fugitives, 432.

G.

Garratt, Mr. A. C., 396.
 "Gaunab," 248.
 Glasgow discussion, 112, 353.
 " Emancipation Society, 353.
 Goodrich's Univ. Geography, 351.
 Grand Jury of St. Louis, 394.
 Green, Rev. Beriah, 41.
 Grimke, A. E., 112.

H.

Harmony Presbytery, 386.
 Harper & Brothers, 374.
 Hawes' Resolution, 343.
 Hayti, 434.
 Hinton, Rev. John Howard, 375.

Hired service, 313.
 Historical facts, 439.
 Hopper, Mr. John, 405.
 Hornblower, Judge, 85.
 Houston, General, 433.
 Hoy, Mr. Barlow, 342.

I.

Illustrations of American commerce, 208.
 Inaugural address, 415.
 Indemnity, Haytian, 433.
 India cotton, 370.
 Indians, Oppression of, 65.
 "Inheritance and possession," 311.
 Insurrection, Alarm of, 109.

J.

Jackson, General, 19.
 Jahn's Archæology, 119.
 Jarchi, 273, 285, 323.
 Jefferson, Thomas, 210.
 Jerome, 285.
 Jonathan, 285.
 Jury trial, 433.

K.

Kentuckian, A, 22.
 Kitchell, Aaron W., 404.

L.

Laban, Saint, 288.
 Land Piracy, 104.
 Langhorne, Rev. Geo. W., 379.
 Lavaysse, Dauxion, 435.
 Lawless, Judge, 394.
 Law of slavery, 344.
 Legislative action, 359.
 Letters of Thomas Jefferson, 210, 212.
 Lovejoy, Rev. E. P., 395.

M.

Mackenzie, W. L. Esq., 350.
 Maimonides, 248, 266, 273, 278, 316.

Maine Gen. Conference, 356.
 Malcolm, Rev. Howard, 101.
 Maria, or Slavery in the U. S., 175.
 Marion College, 397.
 Market House Committee, 401.
 Martineau, Miss Harriet, 452.
 Martin, Severn, 408.
 Maryville Intelligencer, 364.
 Massachusetts' Convention, 83.
 " Resolutions, 361.
 May, Rev. S. J., 73, 226.
 Mayor of Cincinnati, 403.
 Measures, 412.
 Med, Case of slave girl, 362.
 Menochius, 286.
 Methodist Gen. Conference, 378.
 Miller, Rev. Dr., 380.
 Mirror, Maine Christian, 397.
 Mississippi, Affairs of, 367.
 Missouri College, 225.
 Mob in Utica, 188.
 Mobocrats, repenting, 403.
 Mobs, 394.
 Montrose, Presbytery of, 356.
 Moore, Archy, 344.
 Mosaic Servitude, 262.
 Muldrow and Bosley, 395.
 Murder by a slave, 408.
 Murrell, 105.
 Mursell, Rev. Mr., 354.

N.

Nelson, Rev. Dr., persecution of, 395.
 " " testimony of, 135.
 New-Bedford, 427.
 New-Orleans, Caste in, 182.
 New-York Conference, 379.
 North Carolina, Abolitionism in, 363.
 Northern support of slavery, 372.

O.

Observer, N.Y., 397.
 Oceola, 419.
 O'Connell, Mr., 343.
 Onkelos, 288.
 Outlawry of slaves, 407.

P.

Paulus Fagius, 286.
 Pay of Jewish servants, 274.
 Petitions, 431.
 Philanthropist, testimonial to the, 364.
 Pickens, Sentiments of, 71.
 Pinckney's Report, 343.
 Political Action, 429.
 " slave-driving, 9.
 " support of slavery, 412.
 Postell, Rev. J. C., 379.
 Prayers of an expedientist, 54.
 Prejudice, 187, 423.
 Presbyterian Church, Refd., 358
 " Gen. Assembly, 380.
 Presbytery of Indianopolis, 357.
 " of Montrose, 356.
 Press, use of the, 427.
 Price, Dr., 210.
 Pritchard, Wm. H., 341.
 Profligacy of the press, 377.
 Property, Jewish slaves not held as,
 281.
 Publications, 348.
 Punishment of Jewish servants, 299.

R.

Religious character of slaves, 135.
 Reward for killing, 407.
 Rice, 376.
 Rice, Rev. John H. D.D., 41.
 Riker, Hon. Richard, 434.
 Ritner, Governor, 360.
 Rogers, N. P. Esq., 145.

S.

Schools of colored people, 21.
 Senate of Pennsylvania, in regard to co-
 lored people, 20.
 Seventh day Baptists, 356.
 Shipley, Thomas, 347.
 Shooting fugitives, 406, 407, 408.
 Stilliman, Professor, 22.
 Slater, Mrs., 362.
 Slavery, as a punishment, 331.

Slavery compared with political despotism, 23.

" cruelty of, 340, 406.

" is it from above, or from beneath? 238.

" unconstitutional, 145.

" vs. liberty, 22.

Slave produce, 153.

Slaves on their way to Liberia, 132.

" Petitions of, 413.

Slave trade, African, 77.

Smylie, Rev. James, 386.

Society in America, 452.

Spectator, Christian, 41.

Stevens, Hon. Thaddeus, 359.

Stewart, Virgil A., 104.

Strafford county churches, 356.

Stuart, Charles, 11, 153.

Suicide of a slave, 406.

Supreme Court of Massachusetts, 87, 362.

Swain, Hon. B., 405.

Synod of Cincinnati, 356.

T.

Torgums, 285.

Tennessee, Abolitionism in, 364.

Texas, 10, 39, 342, 345, 400, 433.

Thompson, George, 94, 343, 352.

Tobacco, 370.

V.

Vale of Leven, 355.

Van Buren, President, 415.

Vermont, Resolutions of, 361.

Virginian in Scotland, 355.

Voluntariness of Jewish servants, 266.

W.

Wardlaw, Rev. Dr., 353.

Watchman, North Carolina, 363.

Welch, Rev. Dr., 92.

West Indies, Agents to the, 352.

Wheeler, Jacob D., 344.

Wheelock, Miss Caroline, 347.

Whip, Marks of the, 407.

Whitney, 367.

Whittier, John G., 451.

Williams, Rev. Peter, 426.

Women, Aid of, 352.

" Rights of, 66.

Worcester Central Association, 356.

Wright, Rev. Theodore S., 426.

Y.

Yaradee, A plea for Africa, 112.

Yellow fever in Philadelphia, 18.

Z.

Zoological Institute, 425.